DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 893 HE 028 044

AUTHOR	Riley, Herbert J.; And Others
TITLE	Current Trends in Grades and Grading Practices in Undergraduate Higher Education. Results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-929851-20-X
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	85p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AACRAO Distribution Center, P.O. Box 231, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701 ($15 for members, $18 for non-members).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Records; Academic Standards; *Educational Trends; Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; *Higher Education; National Surveys; Registrars (School); School Policy; Student Evaluation; Tables (Data); *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

A national survey of trends in college grading practices was conducted in 1992 by gathering data from college registrars. The survey instrument, which had been field-tested, was sent to registrars at 2,302 institutions and responses were gathered from 1,601 (70 percent response rate). Among the general findings were the following: (1) 97 percent of respondents indicated their institutions use some form of a letter grading system and 90 percent use a 4.0 grading scale; (2) data showed movement away from including transfer grades in both grade point average calculations and in making honors determinations; (3) 98 percent of institutions allow faculty to authorize a grade of "incomplete" in special circumstances; (4) there was great variation between institutions on the time period at which grade changes are no longer allowed and on deadlines for students to drop courses without the enrollment appearing on the permanent academic record; (5) 86 percent of institutions allowed students to repeat courses to better their grades, and the majority of these included the most recent or highest grade in the student's cumulative grade point average. Appendixes contain the survey instrument, further tables of data, and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers member profiles. (Contains 48 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 893

American Association of Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers

GRADES AND GRADING PRACTICES

Results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AACRAO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ad Hoc Committee on
Grades and Grading Practices

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, founded in 1910, is a nonprofit, voluntary, professional education association of degree-granting postsecondary institutions, government agencies, private educational organizations, and education-oriented businesses in the United States and abroad. Its goal is to promote higher education and further the professional development of members working in admissions, enrollment management, financial aid, institutional research, records, and registration.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1993-1994

President: Jeffery M. Tanner, Associate Dean of Admissions and Records, Brigham Young University, UT

President-Elect: Nancy C. Sprotte, Director of Admissions and Records, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA

Past President: Gary L. Smith, Director of Admissions and Registrar, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO

Vice President for Enrollment Management, Admissions, and Financial Aid: Walter H. Washington, Assistant Dean, College of Business Administration, University of Illinois, Chicago

Vice President for International Education: Sylvia K. Higashi, Assistant Dean, CCECS-OSA, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Vice President for Records and Registration: Frederick A. Fresh, University Registrar, Clark Atlanta University, GA

Vice President for Professional Development, Publications, and Research: Kathy G. Plante, Registrar and Director of Admissions, Louisiana State University in Shreveport

Vice President for Regional Associations and Institutional Issues: Carol Medders, Director of Admissions and Enrollment Services and Instructor, School of Health Related Professions, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Secretary-Treasurer: Paul H. Anderson, Associate Dean and University Registrar, Furman University, SC

EXECUTIVE STAFF, AACRAO OFFICE

Executive Director . . . . . Wayne E. Becraft
Associate Executive Director . . . . . Roger Swanson
Assistant Executive Director . . . . . Henrianne Wakefield
Assistant Executive Director . . . . . Cecilia Balazs

AACRAO OFFICE

One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 330
Washington, DC 20036-1171
(202) 293-9161 / FAX: (202) 872-8857

CURRENT TRENDS IN GRADES AND GRADING PRACTICES IN UNDERGRADUATE HIGHER EDUCATION

The Results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey

HERBERT J. RILEY
State University of New York at Binghamton
Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grades and Grading Practices

ROBERT C. CHECCA
University of Scranton
TARA S. SINGER
Western Kentucky University
DONALD F. WORTHINGTON
Trenton State College

Edited by
TARA S. SINGER, Ed.D.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Current trends in grades and grading practices in undergraduate higher education : the results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey / Herbert J. Riley ... [et al.] ; edited by Tara S. Singer

p. cm.

Title on cover: Grades and Grading Practices.

"American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Ad Hoc Committee on Grades and Grading Practices."

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-929851-20-X

1. Grading and marking (Students)—United States—Statistics. 2. College credits—United States—Statistics. I. Riley, Herbert J. II. Singer, Tara S. III. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Ad Hoc Committee on Grades and Grading Practices. IV. Title: Grades and Grading Practices.

LB2368.4.C87 1994

378.1'6721—dc20 94-3195

CIP

Copyright © the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher. Printed in the United States of America.

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained from AACRAO for $18 ($15 for members). For more information, contact the AACRAO Distribution Center, P.O. Box 231, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701; (301) 490-7651; FAX: (301) 206-9789.

AACRAO is not liable for changes in information or federal regulations passed after this volume is published.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iv

CHAPTER ONE - Current Literature on Grades and Grading 1
- Grade Inflation 1
- Pass/Fail Grading 2
- Detailed Grading Systems 2
- Narrative Evaluations 3
- Related Topics 3
- Summary 3

CHAPTER TWO - Methodology of the Study 4
- Instrument Construction 4
- Field Testing 4
- Instrument Revisions 4
- Final Instrument Construction and Distribution 5

CHAPTER THREE - General Findings of the Study 6

CHAPTER FOUR - Analysis of the Data 8
- Institutional Information 8
- Grading Systems 9
- Grade Average Computations 10
- Student Grading Options 14
- Incomplete Coursework 16
- Time Limits 17
- Repeated Courses for Grade Improvement 18
- Grading Policy Issues 20
- Academic Bankruptcy and Forgiveness Policies 20
- Graduation Honors 21

CHAPTER FIVE - Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study 24
- Conclusions 24
- Recommendations for the Future 25

APPENDICES 26
- Appendix A: 1992 AACRAO Survey of Undergraduate Grades and Grading Practices and Related Correspondence 26
- Appendix B: Frequency of Responses by State or Country 31
- Appendix C: Responses to Survey Questions by Type of Institution 32
- Appendix D: Responses to Survey Questions by Size of Institution 54
- Appendix E: AACRAO Membership Profiles 73

REFERENCES 75

PREFACE

This 1992 study on grades and grading practices updates prior American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) studies. The committee took every effort to maintain the basic survey structure to facilitate the measurement of longitudinal trends with data from the previous studies. Trends were measured as appropriate. However, this could not be done for all questions or responses. New items were added to the 1992 study which were not included in either 1971 or 1982, but it is hoped that these topical analyses will prove of value to the AACRAO membership.

First, I want to address the utility of such a publication as *Current Trends in Grades and Grading Practices in Undergraduate Higher Education: The Results of the 1992 AACRAO Study*. This publication is being sent to the institutional contact person listed in the *AACRAO Member Guide*. In many cases, this type of publication receives a cursory glance and is then placed on a bookshelf to be used as a reference whenever a senior academic administrator makes an inquiry. However, I hope this will not be the fate of our publication. There is a considerable amount of good information contained in this publication, and it can provide insights on normative grading practices and other grades and grading issues. I hope that you will want to consider sharing your copy with those individuals on your campus who formulate and implement grading policies. Cultivation of an awareness of the current practices and longitudinal trends in the areas measured by this study may prove beneficial for many members of the academic community. With this thought in mind, you may want to use the AACRAO order form contained in this publication to request additional copies of this publication for the key policy makers at your institution.

Second, I want to thank the many individuals whose hard work facilitated the production of this publication. The 1992 Ad Hoc Committee on Grades and Grading Practices wishes to thank the Board of Directors of AACRAO for their continued support of this project from the beginning to the final completion of this publication. Since work and funding for this major project started two years ago, the three presidents of AACRAO over that time period are thanked for their ongoing commitment to the endeavor—Charles W. McKinney, Gary L. Smith, and Jeffrey M. Tanner. Former AACRAO Vice President for Registration and Records Management, Janet H. Doehlert, was instrumental in providing support and direction to the project. This same level of support has been carried on by her successor, Frederick A. Fresh. The help and encouragement we have received from the AACRAO Office has also been laudable. Executive Director Wayne Becraft has provided advice, encouragement, and support throughout the project. Jennifer Harrison was instrumental in assisting with the final design of the publication and in making arrangements for the printing and distribution of the study. Desiree Milton is to be thanked for her hospitality and for the arrangements she coordinated for the committee during our meeting at the AACRAO Office in Washington, DC.

The biggest "thank you," however, goes to the 1,601 AACRAO institutions which responded to the survey. With a response rate of over 70%, the statistical validity of the study is improved. These data should provide a useful resource on grades and grading practices for registrars, admissions officers, and other academic administrators.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank Gary Slater of Computing Services at the State University of New York at Binghamton for his valuable assistance in providing optical scanning support and comprehensive data analysis for this study. Also, I want to offer a very special note of appreciation for my committee members who spent many hours of their valuable time working on this project. Bob Checca, Tara Singer, and Don Worthington are to be commended for their thorough analysis and reporting of the data from this study. As a committee, we hope you will find this publication both enjoyable and informative.

Herbert J. Riley
University Registrar
State University of New York
at Binghamton, and
Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee
on Grades and Grading Practices

CHAPTER ONE

Current Literature on Grades and Grading

Geisinger (1979) and Quann (1984) both noted that grading has remained a favorite topic of academic administrators over time. In fact, Quann indicated that "debating the pros and cons of the various forms of grading [is] one of the favorite indoor sports of academicians" (p. v). The review of the literature on grades and grading practices validates Quann's point of view.

Quann (1984) traced the awarding of academic marks in the United States back to the 1636 founding of Harvard University. However, Smallwood (1935) credited Yale with developing the first comprehensive grading system. Since the inception of the need to record evaluations of student performance, various philosophies of grading have been espoused. Goldman (1985) noted that grading on a normal curve was the standard practice for many years, but Delworth (1973), and Polcynski and Shirland (1977), indicated a movement toward contract or criterion-referenced grading and argued for its use. Other authors (Lunneborg 1978, Moellenberg 1973) have discussed the motivational effects of awarding grades and have encouraged faculty to consider these factors in their evaluations of student performance.

AACRAO has conducted four previous studies of grades and grading practices. In the first AACRAO study, Nicolson (1917) found that the "A" - "E" or "F" letter grading system was most predominantly used. Hartman (1920) compiled and reported the results of the second AACRAO study. AACRAO did not conduct grading studies again until the early 1970's. Oliver, Berry, Bevan, Cumbie, and Rhine (1971) noted in the third study that colleges and universities were modifying and adjusting their grading systems in response to changing student and faculty demands. However, Quann (1984) found that by 1982, institutions were beginning to move back toward more traditional grading practices in response to grade inflation. Between the 1971 and 1982 AACRAO studies, other authors (Burwen 1971, Collins and Nickel 1974, Suslow 1977) conducted less extensive, but important, national studies of grading practices.

The review of more current information on grades and grading identified four issues relating to grading which have received considerable attention in the recent literature. The continuing phenomenon of grade inflation, the option of pass/fail grading, the development of detailed grading systems, and the use of narrative evaluations are all topics which have given pause to academic administrators and they are discussed in greater detail below.

GRADE INFLATION

Grade inflation has been defined as the significant increase in higher grades received by students since the mid-1960's (Petersen 1972). Grade inflation has also been defined as the increase in student grade point averages (Burwen 1971). Juola (1974) described it as the rise in grade points awarded. However, Wissler (1975) suggested that any definition of grade inflation also needed to include a reference to student aptitude. Consequently, Carney, Isakson, and Ellsworth (1978) used the increase in student grade averages, with a corresponding decrease in student aptitude as measured by composite American College Test (ACT) scores, as the definition of grade inflation in their study.

According to some authors (Goldman 1985, Winsor 1977) grade inflation is a problem higher education inherited from the high schools. Astin, King, and Richardson (1979) found that high school grade point averages had been rising over time, but Oliver (1979) noted that the predictive validity of high school grade point averages had been decreasing at the same time. Others (Davidson 1975, Hendrickson 1976) indicated that the phenomenon developed because faculty and student attitudes about grading have changed. Goldman suggested the changing demographics of the student population may have had an influence. Another set of authors have implied that concern over contributing to a decrease in enrollments through the awarding of low

grades (Oliphant 1980) and the use of student evaluations in tenure and promotion decisions (Grieves 1982) may have also facilitated the development of grade inflation. Finally, Geisinger (1979); Warren (1975); and Winsor (1977) all argued that changes in grading practices and policies also contributed to the rise in median grade point averages and the increased frequency of the awarding of higher grades. The inclusion of transfer grades in cumulative grade point averages and in making honors determinations, the reluctance to use "F" grades as penalty marks, the expansion of withdrawal options, the allowance of pass/fail grading options, and the continued existence of the standard letter grading system ("A" "B" etc. with no pluses and/or minuses) have all been identified as culprits which have accelerated the development of grade inflation in higher education.

Grade inflation continues to be a serious problem in higher education. It devalues the accomplishments of students who truly have performed exceptionally well (Davidson 1975), and it lessens the significance of graduation and other academic honors (Bolin 1975). According to O'Connor (1979), "Grade inflation cheapens the academic product. It invites cynicism and suspicion about achievement in American colleges and universities" (p. 295). Oliphant (1980) notes, "Higher education has lost much public confidence because of the problem of over-inflated grading standards" (p. 431). Cole (1993) discusses how it has become more difficult to distinguish between good and bad work in academe because of grade inflation. Others report that the existence of grade inflation may also have serious consequences for students who are attempting to gain graduate or professional school admission or employment (Helmreich 1977, Suslow 1977).

PASS/FAIL GRADING

Many institutional culprits were identified in the review of the literature as causes of grade inflation. However, the most tangible reason given for the rise in student grade point averages over the last 25 years was the introduction of pass/fail or other similar student grading options. Bolin (1975); Davidson (1975); and Helmreich (1977) have implied that this grading practice has been one of the most significant causes of the phenomenon of grade inflation and it has been indicated that in order to limit the phenomenon, institutions must restrict the use of the pass/fail or other similar grading options.

Quann (1974) indicated that the pass/fail grading option was originally implemented to encourage students to explore academic disciplines outside of their regular area of study. However, he also found that it was predominantly used by students "to complete requirements rather than for academic exploration" (p. 234). His research at Washington State University revealed that its usage significantly decreased when the institutional policy was changed to disallow use of this grading option in lower level courses. However, he later noted (1984) that this grading option retained its popularity among students because it allowed them to spend less time on the pass/fail courses and more time on their "regularly graded course work" (p. 20).

Other faults have been found with the pass/fail grading option. Claunch (1972) noted that students tended to use this grading option in the courses in which the lowest grades were expected and in which they intended to do substandard work. Quann (1974) implied that the pass/fail option was more frequently used by students with lower grade averages than by students with exceptional academic records. Bromley, Crow, and Gibson (1978) also suggested that students used this grading option to artificially raise or protect their grade point averages. They found that pass/fail is used as a mechanism for "camouflaging students' 'real' performance" (p. 696).

DETAILED GRADING SYSTEMS

At the conclusion of the 1982 AACRAO Study, Quann (1984) noted that an increasing number of colleges and universities were adding pluses and/or minuses to their letter grading systems. The literature has identified a number of possible explanations for the increased use of the plus and/or minus grading system in higher education.

Philbrick and O'Donnell (1968) analyzed the effects of the implementing a plus and/or minus grading system and discovered that when such systems were employed, student grade point averages went down. Therefore, there may be an expectation that such grading systems will help control the rate of grade inflation. However, Quann (1987) cautioned that this approach to curtailing grade inflation was only effective if the grade of "A+" did not receive more quality points than were assigned with a grade of "A." Singleton and Smith (1978) argued that institutions which implemented plus and/or minus grading systems would also help their instructional faculty in awarding more reliable grades of student performance. They noted that the predictive validity of a student's record (for success in post-baccalaureate studies) would be more accurate if the student was evaluated on a plus and/or minus scale even with the existence of inflated grades. Finally, Quann acknowledged that fractionated grading systems provide for more accuracy in grading, and therefore, they reduce assessment errors due to grouping.

Other, more detailed, grading systems have been proposed in higher education. Hendrickson (1976) indicated that letter grades cover a whole range of performance, but he found that the use of numerical grades forced instructors into awarding grades which more precisely evaluate student achievement. He also suggested that the use of a numerical grading system would reduce grade inflation since instructors often resolve borderline cases in favor of the higher grade when whole letters are used. Grieves (1982) recommended implementing a numerical four-point grading system in which both the student grade earned and the average grade earned in the class are reflected on the transcript. She indicated that this change would not only help those who review transcripts make better determinations of who are the most distinguished students, but it would also encourage faculty to award more accurate grades. Cole (1993) and de Nevers (1984) also called for the implementation of similar types of detailed grading systems.

NARRATIVE EVALUATIONS

Quann (1992) traced the development of the narrative evaluation grading system at the University of California - Santa Cruz back to 1965. He indicated this grading system developed during a period when students and faculty both loudly expressed their concerns over the inadequacies of traditional grading systems found in higher education. However, he noted that this practice originated in colonial America. Since that time, a number of other institutions have experimented with alternative forms of grading. A recent edition of the *Directory of Colleges and Universities with Non-Traditional Programs, Systems, and Practices* (1987), published by AACRAO, listed 31 institutions which employ narrative grading. This approach to grading was designed to encourage the focus of course enrollment to be on learning and not on the simple achievement of grades, according to Quann.

A number of advantages and disadvantages of using narrative grading systems have been identified. Levine (1981) has especially noted the benefits of the personal attention and assessment given to each individual student which narratives provide. However, Quann (1992) has cited the problems of producing, collecting, and maintaining narrative evaluations, including the cost. Finally, he also identified the potential ramifications which the use of narrative evaluations might have for students applying to graduate or professional schools or attempting to transfer. Quann found the accepting institutions may require the colleges and universities which employ narratives to convert the evaluations into grades which may be used in admissions and financial aid decisions. He indicated this process may lead to a substantial delay in admission for these students.

RELATED TOPICS

Griffith (1988) and Quann (1984) both suggested institutions concerned with grade inflation should discontinue replacing repeated course grades with either the most recent grade or the grade from the best attempt. They indicated such institutions should average grades from multiple attempts of a course in order to discourage students from repeating courses simply for grade point average improvement. However, in a study conducted by Singer (1993), she found the trend to be toward replacing repeated course grades. The literature on academic bankruptcy may explain the reasons why.

Academic bankruptcy, or forgiveness, allows the student the opportunity to improve his/her academic standing by disregarding a portion of the student's previous academic record (Quann 1984). Three institutions responding to the 1982 survey indicated they were planning to implement such a policy (Quann); however, the results of the 1992 AACRAO Study revealed that 406 institutions had an academic forgiveness policy and another 127 were considering implementing one. According to Ross (1989), institutions have begun to disregard prior academic performance as a means of attracting and retaining adult students and a liberal repeated course policy may be a component of such bankruptcy policies.

The literature also revealed changes over time in attitudes toward failure grades and their treatment in grade point average calculations. According to Scott (1975), Brown and Yale abolished the use of failure grades in the 1970's. Winsor (1977) indicated that increasingly fewer institutions calculated "F" grades in the computation of grade averages. Bess (1975) implied that this practice was initiated in response to concerns related to the fact that "F" was often used as both an academic and administrative grade. However, Quann (1984) found in the 1982 AACRAO Study that institutions were returning to treating "F" grades as penalty marks. The Singer (1993) study also found a significant increase in the number of institutions which assign, record, and compute failing grades in the student grade point average.

SUMMARY

According to a review of the current literature, the arguments over grades and grading systems continue as favorite pastimes of academicians. Grade inflation remains one of the primary topics of concern. As recently as 1993, Cole commented on the deleterious effects of the phenomenon. Grading policies, such as allowing pass/fail enrollment, and administrative policies, including the use of student evaluations in promotion and tenure decisions, have been identified as two of the culprits which contribute to grade inflation. However, Singer (1993) found that many colleges and universities were implementing more conservative and restrictive grading practices. Her research indicated these changes may have been made in an attempt to further limit the effects of grade inflation.

According to the literature, pass/fail grading has fallen out of favor on many campuses. The link between this grading practice and grade inflation (Bolin 1975, Davidson 1975) may explain why its usage has been reduced (Singer 1993). The rapid development of detailed grading systems, most notably plus/minus scales, has been recorded in the literature. Grieves (1982), Quann (1987), and Cole (1993) each have suggested that use of fractionated grading systems provides students with more information about their course performance and may help to reduce grade inflation.

The review of the literature indicated that several institutions continue to maintain their narrative evaluation systems (Quann 1992). The literature review also revealed explanations for why increasing numbers of institutions have implemented academic bankruptcy policies or are considering them (Ross 1989). Singer (1993) found that the treatment of failure grades as penalty marks had resumed as a standard practice throughout higher education. However, Singer also noted the practice of allowing repeated courses to replace previous grades with the grade from the most recent attempt or from the best attempt had also expanded in recent years.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodology of the Study

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars, the forerunner of AACRAO, completed its first survey of grading practices in 1917. This study was followed with a more extensive survey in 1920. As Quann (1984) noted, grades and grading practices continue to be of interest to modern day educators. This interest is the underlying reason for AACRAO's on-going research in this area.

In this section, the steps taken in construction of the survey instrument will be reviewed. The data collection methods utilized during the 1992 AACRAO Study will be discussed as well.

In the summer of 1991, the AACRAO Board of Directors, through its Academic Policies and Practices Committee, appointed a new Ad Hoc Committee on Grades and Grading Practices. The committee was charged by AACRAO Vice President for Registration and Records Management, Janet Doehlert, with the task of updating the grading survey and gathering information on longitudinal trends in grades and grading practices. After several personnel changes, the final committee was composed of Donald F. Worthington, Registrar at Trenton State College; Robert C. Checca, Registrar at the University of Scranton; Tara S. Singer, then a doctoral student at the University of Louisville and now employed at Western Kentucky University; and Herbert J. Riley, University Registrar at the State University of New York at Binghamton. Mr. Riley also served as chair of the committee.

INSTRUMENT CONSTRUCTION

In August of 1991, Mr. Riley sent the original committee members a draft copy of the proposed 1992 survey for their review. The original draft of the 1992 survey was modeled on the 1982 instrument, but it also incorporated some additional items. The additional items were developed based on Quann's (1984) recommendations for future grading surveys and were also based on the research interests of the committee members. After reviewing the draft survey, the committee members shared their questions and concerns about the instrument through electronic mail. Mr. Riley completed the initial revisions which were made in preparation for field testing.

FIELD TESTING

A revised draft of the survey was once again distributed to the original committee members. At this point, the four members of the committee were each assigned the responsibility of distributing the revised draft survey to approximately fifteen of their professional colleagues for completion. The revised draft survey was sent to sixty institutions in the pilot testing of the instrument. The pilot testing was completed in October, November, and December of 1991.

The field test respondents were instructed to return their completed surveys to the committee member who originally sent them the survey. Forty-seven completed surveys were returned. Following individual reviews of the returned pilot surveys, the committee members met in January of 1992 to review the field test results and to finalize the construction of the instrument.

INSTRUMENT REVISIONS

At the time of the January 1992 meeting of the committee, significant modifications were made to the questions dealing with student grading options and the section dealing with graduation honors was made more specific. Minor modifications were also made in item construction in order to facilitate the translation of the instrument into a machine readable (scannable) format.

In April of 1992, a second revised draft of the survey was distributed to approximately one hundred people attending an interest session at the annual AACRAO meeting in Dallas, Texas. No significant changes were suggested by the interest session participants.

FINAL INSTRUMENT CONSTRUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

In June of 1992, the second revised draft of the survey was sent to National Computer Systems, Incorporated for conversion into a machine readable format. This was done in order to facilitate the processing of data once the completed surveys were received.

The final survey instruments were sent to the registrars at the 2,302 AACRAO member institutions in August of 1992 and were accompanied by a cover letter from Mr. Riley. A copy of both the survey and the cover letter are included in Appendix A. Respondents were asked to complete the surveys and return them to Mr. Riley by October 1, 1992. A total of 1,601 usable surveys were returned and scanned for data processing. The 1992 survey had a response rate of 70%.

CHAPTER THREE

General Findings of the Study

Throughout the last thirty-five years, institutions have experimented with various grading scales, systems, and policies in response to changing institutional concerns. The 1971 AACRAO Study revealed a trend toward non-traditional grading systems and practices. However, by the time the 1982 AACRAO Study was conducted, the responding institutions indicated a movement toward increasingly conservative and restrictive grading practices. The 1992 AACRAO Study has found that the trend toward more conservative grading systems and policies has continued during the past decade.

The basic four point letter grading system has retained its predominance in higher education. Nearly 97% of the 1992 respondents indicated their institutions use some form of a letter grading system and close to 90% of the reporting institutions employ a 4.0 grading scale[1]. However, since the 1982 AACRAO Study, the number of institutions which have moved from a letter-only grading systems to a detailed grading scale has been significant. Detailed grading systems are those which include plus (+) and/or minus (-) indicators, combined letter numeric systems, and non-letter grading systems including numerical systems. In 1982, 59% of the responding institutions used letter only grading systems. however, by 1992, that percentage had dropped to close to 47%. Also, since 1982, the number of institutions which include plus and/or minus indicators has increased by 12%.

The 1992 AACRAO Study revealed a movement away from including transfer grades in both grade point average calculations and in making honors determinations. In 1982, 28% included transfer grades in grade average calculations, but by 1992, only 19% included grades earned from courses at other institutions in the student's average. This decrease may be attributed to a belief among faculty that a student's current quality rating should not reflect the quality of work completed at another institution (Quann 1984). In 1982, 44% of the reporting institutions included transfer grades when making honors determinations, but in 1992, that percentage had declined to 27%. These decreases may be explained by institutional attempts to limit grade inflation by only using native coursework and grades in making academic policy decisions (Singer 1993). The pass/fail grading option may be falling out of favor in many institutions of higher education. This student grading option has been identified as one of the significant culprits in the development of grade inflation (Bolin 1975, Davidson 1975). In 1982, 59% of the responding institutions indicated using this grading option. By 1992, that percentage had dropped to 52%. However, no significant evidence of greater restrictions being placed upon pass/fail grading options was found. There was a small percentage increase (2%) in the number of institutions limiting pass/fail to elective courses. This small change may indicate that once institutions philosophically accept pass/fail as a form of evaluation it then becomes an acceptable grading option regardless of class content or applicability to a student's degree program.

Almost all institutions allow faculty to authorize grades of "incomplete" (98%) in special circumstances. According to 82% of the respondents, incompletes are most often awarded at the discretion of the faculty member. The conditions under which incompletes are authorized, however, are somewhat varied. The 1992 respondents indicated that incompletes are most frequently given in cases where the student has had substantiated medical

[1]The narrative section of this text uses figures from the analysis of the data without consideration to the size or type of the institution. Therefore, there may be some small differences between the narrative numbers and those presented in Appendix C and Appendix D. There are also some differences in the total figures between those two appendices because some institutions failed to provide size or type of institution.

problems or when the majority of the coursework has been completed prior to the end of the term. The results of the 1992 survey also revealed that the largest percentage (33.3%) of the respondents only allow students until the end of the next term to resolve the incomplete.

Institutional statutes of limitations on grade changes seem to vary widely across institutions. Many institutions do not have a set time period at which grade changes will no longer be allowed. The 1992 AACRAO Study also found great variation in the deadlines for students to drop courses without having the enrollment appear on the permanent academic record.

The 1971 and 1982 surveys both asked several questions concerning repeated course policies as did the 1992 survey. The most recent survey found that 86% of the responding institutions allow students the opportunity to repeat courses to better their grades. The majority of these institutions (47%) reported including only the most recent or the highest grade earned in the student's cumulative grade point average.

The 1992 survey included two new sections which were not contained in previous studies. The first new section focused on grading policy issues. The respondents were asked whether there were varying grading systems for different academic units within institutions. Only 3% of the survey respondents indicated they had to manage multiple grading systems. The respondents were also asked about the administrative structure which formulates grading policy at their institution. There were varying responses to these questions, but 67% of the respondents indicated that grading policy was formulated through the work of participative forums and not by academic administration.

The 1982 survey did not specifically ask questions concerning academic bankruptcy or forgiveness policies. Therefore, little comparative data for this section of the 1992 survey was available. In 1982, three institutions indicated recent adoption of an academic bankruptcy policy. According to the 1992 respondents, the majority of the survey institutions still do not offer such a policy (64%), but close to 9% are currently considering one. On the other hand, 402 of the responding institutions (28%) reported having an academic bankruptcy policy.

The number of institutions which award some form of graduation honors has continued at a relatively high level over the course of time. The 1982 AACRAO Study found that over 83% of the responding institutions awarded some form of graduation honors. According to the data collected for the 1992 AACRAO Study, 89% still award some form of graduation honors. However, a significant change was found in the way in which students are identified for graduation honors. At the time of the 1982 survey, 95% of the responding institutions awarded honors based on a minimum grade point average. However, according to the data collected for the 1992 AACRAO Study, only 85% of the responding institutions still award graduation honors in this fashion. Currently, 15% of the responding institutions use percentage of graduating class as the yardstick in honors determination.

The pace at which institutions have been making significant changes in their grading systems and in their policies for awarding graduation honors has slowed since the last AACRAO Study. Of the 1982 survey participants, 26% reported that they had made significant changes in their grading policies since the 1971 AACRAO Study. Only 12% of the 1992 survey participants indicated that a substantive change in institutional grading had occurred in the five-year period prior to the most recent study. A majority (91%) of the respondents who reported substantive changes reported the addition of plus and/or minus notations to an existing letter grading system. Only 4% of the 1992 participating colleges and universities reported pending major revisions in grading systems and policies. Finally, just a little over 12% indicated an intent to change criteria for graduation honors in the near future with the majority of these respondents noting plans for making criteria more stringent.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of the Data

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

As noted earlier, there were 1,601 institutions which responded to the 1992 survey. The breakdown of respondents by location of institution (states and countries) is found in Appendix B. Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain the information on respondents identified by type of institution (program type and funding control), size of institution, and calendar format of institution.

Table 1

Is your institution a:

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Two-year public community or junior college	333	21.8
Two-year private community or junior college	54	3.5
Four-year public college	122	8.0
Four-year private college	489	31.9
Four-year public university	294	19.2
Four-year private university	179	11.7
Graduate or professional only (no undergraduates)	65	4.2
TOTAL	1,536	

These data reveal that since the 1982 survey, the number of two-year public community or junior colleges has increased while the number of four-year private colleges has decreased. In 1982, there were 307 (19%) two-year public community colleges which responded to the survey; however, by 1992, 333 (22%) institutions were in this category of respondents. In contrast, in 1982, there were 586 (36%) private four-year colleges participating in the survey, but in 1992 there were only 489 (32%) schools in this category. This decrease may be explained, however, by the increase in the number of four-year private universities reported in 1992. In 1982, there were 162 (10%) private four-year universities responding to the survey. In 1992, 179 (12%) institutions were classified in this category. Between 1982 and 1992, several private four-year colleges may have become private four-year universities. There was virtually no difference in the number or percentage of institutions which offer only graduate or professional programs between the two most recent surveys (68 - 4% in 1982 and 65 - 4% in 1992).

Table 2

Indicate the size of your institution based on Fall 1991 total student enrollment. (Use headcount, not FTE—do not include extension, correspondence, etc.)

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Less than 2,500	683	46.3
2,500-4,999	248	16.8
5,000-9,999	243	16.5
10,000-19,999	190	12.9
More than 20,000	112	7.4
TOTAL	1,476	

The growth in overall collegiate enrollments is evidenced in the data collected for Table 2. In 1982, 55% of the responding institutions had enrollments under 2,500, but only 46% of the responding institutions were in that category in 1992. The number of institutions with smaller enrollments is decreasing according to this data. On the other hand, the percentage of institutions with headcount enrollments of 5,000 or more students went from 27% in 1982 to 37% in 1992. Most significantly, only 53 (4%) schools indicated they enrolled 20,000 or more students in 1982; in 1992, 114 (8%) institutions reported headcounts of this size.

While the 1982 survey collected information on calendar types, the information was not included in the final report of that study. Therefore, no comparisons can be made. However, the responses to the 1992 survey indicate extensive use of the early semester academic calendar format. According to the definitions used for this survey, when the early semester academic calendar format is employed the term ends before the Christmas break. A little over 70% of the responding institutions operate under this calendar format.

Table 3

What type of academic calendar is currently used by your institution?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Early semester (fall ends before Christmas)	1,030	70.1
Traditional semester (break at Christmas and complete fall after the break)	64	4.4
Term or quarter	206	14.0
Trimester	33	2.2
4-1-4	97	6.6
Other	40	2.7
TOTAL	1,470	

GRADING SYSTEMS

The survey asked respondents to identify undergraduate grading systems by type of grading system and grading scale currently in use. Table 4 presents the response patterns by the three main categories: letter grades, numerical grades, and narrative grading. Responses below are grouped by those using the 4.0 scale and institutions using other grading scales. Of the survey respondents to Question 6, 1,576 provided usable responses. Nearly 97% or 1,525 of the respondents indicated their schools employed some form of letter grading; 42 (2%) use numeric grades; and 11 (1%) use narrative grading.

Table 4

Which of the following grading systems *best* describes your current grading systems?

RESPONSE	NUMBER			PERCENT
	4.0 SCALE	OTHER SCALES	TOTAL	
Letter grades	1,392	133	1,525	96.6
Numerical grades	25	17	42	2.7
Narrative grades *	0	11	11	0.7
TOTAL	1,417 (89.8)	161 (10.2)	1,578	

* For the purposes of the 1992 survey, narrative grades are those which can not be converted to a numeric or letter equivalent.

The 1992 AACRAO Study found that nearly 97% of the respondents used some form of letter grades, which is slightly higher than the nearly 92% reported in 1982. In 1982, a grading system category "other" was used to classify certain grading types, and 5% of the usable responses were counted in that category. The 1992 survey did not include a category "other." Therefore, types of grading such as letter grades with intermediate symbols (A, AB, B, BC, C, CD, D, F) and letter grades with no failing marks are likely included among responses in the grading system type "letters only". This increase in the percentage of respondents indicating use of letters grades may reflect the differences in grading categories between the 1982 and 1992 studies. However, it may also be indicative of institutions moving away from intermediate symbols and letter grades without a fail grade to grading systems which utilize traditional letter grades.

Table 5 reports variations in letter grading within the 4.0 and other grading scales. Of the 1,578 usable responses, 727 (46%) of the institutions indicated they use letter grades only; 566 (36%) use letters with plus and minus; 96 (6%) use letters with plus only; 6 institutions (less than 1%) use letters with minus only; and 67 (4%) use combined letter and numeric systems.

Table 5

Variations in Letter Grading Systems (all respondents)

RESPONSE	NUMBER			PERCENT
	4.0 SCALE	OTHER SCALES	TOTAL	
Letters only	676	51	727	46.1
Letters with (+) (-)	566	0	566	35.9
Letters with (+) only	96	0	96	6.1
Letters with (-) only	6	0	6	0.4
Combined letters and numeric	48	19	67	4.3
Letters and a percentage	0	63	63	4.0
Letter grade subtotal	1,392 (91.3%)	133 (8.7%)	1,525	96.8
Numeric grades	25	17	42	2.7
Narratives only	0	11	11	0.7
TOTAL	1,417 (89.8%)	161 (10.2%)	1,578	

Nearly 90% of the respondents indicated that their institutions use the 4.0 grading scale. Table 6 (see page 11) lists common variations within the 4.0 scale by institutional type. Of the 1,417 usable responses, 676 (48%) reported use of letter grades only; 566 (nearly 40%) use letters with plus and minus; 96 (7%) use letters and plus only; 6 (less than 1%) use letters and minus only; and 48 (3%) use a combined letter and numeric system.

Tables 7 and 8 reflect the percentages of 1992 respondents reporting a variation of the 4.0 scale by institutional type in comparison with the data presented in the 1982 study. Analysis of the change in grading system variation indicates a decline in the percentage of institutions reporting use of letter grades only. In 1982, 61% indicated utilizing a letter grade only system and 25% used a plus/minus grading system. In 1992, 48% of the respondents noted their institutions had a letter grade only system and 40% used a plus/minus grading system.

An increase in the use of letters with plus and minus symbols was reported in the 1982 AACRAO Study (Quann 1984). The data collected in 1992 imply a continuing trend in the increase of the number of institutions utilizing grading systems which include letter grades with pluses and/or minuses.

Table 7

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGE	4-YEAR COLLEGE	4-YEAR UNIVERSITY	TOTAL
Letter grades only	-12.9%	-14.9%	-15.0%	-13.5%
Letter with (+) (-)	+ 8.9%	+19.0%	+16.6%	+14.9%
Letter with (+) only	+ 3.2%	-1.6%	+ 0.7%	+ 0.3%
Letter with (-) only	0.0%	+ 0.6%	+ 0.2%	+ 0.3%
Combined letter and numeric	+ 0.7%	+ 1.7%	0.0%	+ 0.9%

In Table 8 (see page 11) , the data used in Table 6 are further examined by dividing the 1,417 usable responses by institutional status, public or private, within institutional type. Seventy-two percent of the two-year public institutions reported using letter grades only; only 30% of the private four-year universities indicating use of the letter grades only system.

Differences between the 1982 and 1992 responses begin to emerge in Tables 9 and 10 (see page 12). In Table 9, the data used in Table 6 are cross-tabulated by institutional control (public or private funding) and by institutional program type (two-year college, four-year college, and four-year university). Table 9 displays the percentage of respondents indicating a variation on the 4.0 scale by institutional control and type with similar data from the 1982 study. Respondents indicating use of letter grades with plus and minus symbols, plus only, and minus only are all combined in the letters and (+) (-) percentage gain/loss reported in Table 9. The data in Table 10 suggest a decrease in use of the traditional letters only grading system across all categories of institutions when analyzed by program type and control.

After the 1982 AACRAO Study, Quann (1984) noted: Public institutions of all sizes who responded to the survey tend to rely more on traditional letter grades, while private colleges and universities of all size appear to allow more variation in grading, with letter grades and plus-minus indicators in nearly half the cases (p. 32).

The data collected in 1992 tend to support Quann's conclusion. Data arrayed in Table 11 (see page 13) indicate that 232 (72%) of the two-year public institutions, 62 (52%) of the four-year public colleges and 152 (57%) of the four-year public universities use the traditional letter grades only. Two-hundred and sixty-four (57%) of the respondents from four-year private colleges and 92 (53%) from four-year private universities indicated a preference for letters with plus and/or minus grading symbols.

The survey asked respondents to report substantive changes to their grading systems which occurred during the last five years and those anticipated in the next five years. Of the 1,495 usable responses listed in Table 12 (see page 13), 184 (12%) of the respondents indicated that a substantive grading change had occurred. Of these, 168 (91%) added plus and/or minus symbols to their grading system which confirms the trend presented in the earlier tables. Further, Table 12 shows that 57 (4%) respondents anticipate a grading change in the next five years, of which 50 (88%) plan to add plus and/or minus symbols. Therefore, as Quann noted in 1984, the frequency of modifications in grading systems are decreasing over time.

The respondents to the 1992 survey also indicated that policies on failing grades are becoming increasingly conservative and restrictive. While the 1982 respondents indicated that 93% of the reporting institutions assigned, recorded, and computed failing grades in the student's grade point average, the 1992 schools reported that percentage had increased to 97%. Table 13 compares the 1992 responses to Question 9.

Table 13

Which of the following *best* describes your policy on "failing" grades?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Assigned, recorded on the permanent record, and included in grade average	1,426	97.1
Assigned, recorded on the permanent record, but not included in grade average	22	1.5
Assigned, but not recorded on the permanent record	10	0.7
Assigned, but recorded on the permanent record with a mark other than a symbol which would represent failure	7	0.5
Not assigned, but record of attempt is kept	4	0.2
Not assigned, and no record is kept	0	0.0
TOTAL	1,469	

GRADE AVERAGE COMPUTATIONS

The 1992 AACRAO Study found that institutions were increasingly not including transfer grades in the student's cumulative grade point average. In 1982, 28% included transfer grades, but by 1992, only 19% included grades earned from courses at other institutions in the student's average. This decrease may be explained by changes in grading policies in response to what

Table 6

Letter and/or numeric using the 4.0 system. (If you use an "A+" and then count the value higher than 4.0, answer one of these questions.) Variations of grading systems on 4.0 scale all responses by type of institution—1992

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGES		4-YEAR COLLEGES		4-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Letter grades only	256	69.2	208	35.4	204	46.2	668	47.8
Letters with (+) (-)	68	18.4	306	52.8	182	41.2	556	40.0
Letters with (+) only	21	5.7	41	7.0	31	7.0	93	6.7
Letters with (-) only	0	0.0	4	0.7	2	0.5	6	0.4
Letters and numbers	14	3.8	20	3.4	14	3.2	48	3.4
Letter grade subtotal	359	97.0	579	99.3	433	98.0	1,371	98.3
Numeric grades	11	3.0	4	0.7	9	2.0	24	1.7
TOTAL	370		583		442		1,395	

Table 8

Variations in grading systems on 4.0 scale by type of institution—a comparison of percentage responses 1982 to 1992

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGE		4-YEAR COLLEGE		4-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL		% CHANGE
	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	
Letter grades only	82.1	69.2	50.3	35.4	61.2	46.2	61.3	47.8	-13.5
Letter with (+) (-)	9.5	18.4	33.8	52.8	24.6	41.2	25.1	40.0	+14.9
Letters with (+) only	2.5	5.7	8.6	7.0	6.3	7.0	6.4	6.7	+0.3
Letters with (-) only	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	+0.3
Letters and numbers	3.1	3.8	1.7	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.4	+0.9
Other	2.8	2.9	5.5	0.7	4.4	2.0	4.6	1.7	-2.9

Table 9

Variations on grading systems on 4.0 scale by institutional status within institutional type—a comparison of percentage responses 1982 to 1992

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGE				4-YEAR COLLEGE				4-YEAR UNIVERSITY				TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		PRIVATE		PUBLIC		PRIVATE		PUBLIC		PRIVATE			
	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992
Letter grades only	85.5	72.3	63.6	49.0	69.0	52.1	46.3	31.1	68.2	56.5	46.7	30.1	60.9	47.8
Letters with (+) (-)	8.1	20.3	30.9	49.0	22.5	42.0	46.7	65.2	23.3	39.0	46.7	63.6	31.9	47.1
Letters and numbers	3.8	4.0	1.8	2.0	1.6	5.0	1.9	3.0	4.7	4.1	0.7	1.7	2.6	3.4
Other	2.7	3.4	3.6	0.0	7.0	0.9	5.1	0.7	3.8	0.4	5.9	4.6	4.6	1.7

Table 10

Variations on letter grading system on 4.0 scale by institutional status and institutional type—1992 percentage responses minus 1982 percentage responses

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGE		4-YEAR COLLEGE		4-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	
Letter grades only	-13.2	-14.6	-16.9	-15.2	-11.7	-17.6	-13.1
Letters with (+) (-)	+12.2	+18.1	+19.5	+18.5	+15.7	+16.9	+15.2
Letters and numbers	+0.2	+0.2	+3.4	+1.1	-0.6	+1.0	+0.8
Other *	+0.7	+0.0	-6.1	-4.4	-3.4	-1.3	-2.9

* This category includes numerical and other reported grading variations on the 4.0 scale.

Table 11

Variations on grading system on 4.0 scale—all responses by institutional type and status

RESPONSE	2-YEAR COLLEGES				4-YEAR COLLEGES				4-YEAR UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		PRIVATE		PUBLIC		PRIVATE		PUBLIC		PRIVATE			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Letter grades only	232	72.3	24	49.0	62	52.1	144	31.1	152	56.5	52	30.1	668	47.8
Letters with (+) (-)	50	15.6	18	36.7	42	36.1	264	57.0	90	33.5	92	53.2	556	40.0
Letters with (+) only	15	4.7	6	12.3	6	5.0	35	7.6	13	4.8	18	10.4	93	6.7
Letters with (-) only	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	3	0.6	2	0.7	0	0.0	6	0.4
Letters and numbers	13	4.0	1	2.0	6	5.0	14	3.0	11	4.1	3	1.7	48	3.4
Letter grades subtotal	310	96.6	49	100.0	117	99.1	460	99.3	268	99.6	165	95.4	1,371	98.3
Numeric grades	11	3.4	0	0.0	1	0.9	3	0.7	1	0.4	8	4.6	24	1.7
TOTAL	321		49		118		463		269		173		1,395	

Table 12

Substantive grading system changes for all respondents

RESPONSE	OCCURRED IN LAST FIVE YEARS		ANTICIPATED IN NEXT FIVE YEARS	
	#	%	#	%
Added (+) and/or (-)	168	91.3	50	87.7
To letter grades from numeric grades	7	3.8	0	0.0
To letter grades from narrative evaluations	0	0.0	1	1.8
To numeric grades from letter grades	7	3.8	2	3.5
To numeric grades from narrative evaluations	0	0.0	1	1.8
To narrative evaluations from letter grades	0	0.0	0	0.0
To narrative evaluations from numeric grades	1	0.5	0	0.0
To percentages from letter grades	1	0.5	1	1.8
To percentages from narrative evaluations	0	0.0	2	3.5
Grading System Changes Subtotal	184	99.9	57	100.1
No Substantive Grading System Change to Report	1,311		1,438	
TOTAL	1,495		1,495	

Quann (1984) described as a widely held belief among faculty that a student's current quality rating should not reflect the quality of work completed at another institution. Singer (1993) also found that institutions may no longer be including transfer grades in cumulative grade point average calculations in their attempts to limit grade inflation.

Table 14

When determining a student's cumulative grade average, does your institution enter all grades including transfer work in the calculations or use only the grades earned at your institution?

RESPONSE	1982		1992	
	#	%	#	%
Enter all grades including transfer work	378	27.8	274	18.8
Use only grades earned at reporting institution	983	72.2	1,182	81.2
TOTAL	1,361		1,456	

STUDENT GRADING OPTIONS

This section concentrates on the usage of student grading options, such as pass/fail or similar options (credit/no credit, satisfactory/ unsatisfactory, etc.) as indicated by the survey respondents. Institutions which responded that students were allowed to employ such grading options were asked to complete a series of additional questions relating to policies restricting pass/fail grading.

Of the usable 1,486 responses to the 1992 survey, 52% noted the allowance of pass/fail in comparison with 59% offering this grading option in 1982. While schools of all categories (by size) reported a decrease in the tendency to allow pass/fail grading, the greatest reduction of use was found in schools with head-count enrollments of under 2,500 students.

Table 15

Does your institution permit students to opt to take courses using the "pass/fail" (or similar) grading option?

SIZE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1982	
< 2,500	58.5	49.6	-8.9
2,500-9,999	58.3	49.9	-8.4
10,000-19,999	67.9	57.4	-10.5
20,000 +	76.9	70.8	-6.1
All institutions	58.9	52.4	-6.5

When viewed by type of school, the two-year schools had the lowest incidence of pass/fail, as was the case in 1982. The data from both the 1982 and 1992 surveys correspond in that they showed four-year institutions have a much higher percentage of use of the pass/fail grading option than two-year schools. In 1992, 100 (30%) of the two-year public colleges reported use of pass/fail while only 90 (34%) indicated its usage in 1982. Six (11%) of the two-year private institutions noted utilization of this grading option in 1992, but in 1982, 14 (24%) indicated its use.

In looking at the data by institutional control and program types, for four-year institutions, the percentage range of institutions allowing pass/fail grading was 59% to 67%. In 1982, the percentage range was 60% to 73%. Again, following the trend found in the 1982 data, it was found in 1992 that larger institutions are more likely to offer pass/fail grading options as indicated in Table 15.

As can be seen in Table 16, nearly half (49%) of the 1992 responding institutions limit pass/fail to one course per term. However, 36% of the 1992 respondents indicated their institutions have no limit on the number of courses which can be taken pass/fail during a single term. In 1982, the corresponding percentages for these two items were 53% and 31% respectively. In the past ten years, there has been a 6% increase in the number of schools which have no limit on the number of pass/fail options employed in a single term.

Table 16

How many courses per term (quarter or semester) can a student take using this student (pass/fail) grading option?

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
One	52.6	49.3	-3.3
Two	8.5	10.7	+2.2
Three	1.9	1.6	-0.3
Four or more	6.4	2.1	-4.3
No limit	30.6	36.3	+5.7

It is interesting to note that while the number of institutions allowing the use of pass/fail grading is decreasing overall, those that employ this grading option are using it less restrictively. According to the 1992 data, this is evidenced by the increase in the percentage of schools which place no limit on the maximum number of pass/fail options which can be taken in a single semester. On the other hand, Table 17 shows that colleges and universities are becoming more restrictive on the number of pass/fail courses allowed in an undergraduate career.

Table 17

How many courses during an undergraduate academic career can a student take using this student grading option?

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
1 to 3	8.8	14.2	+5.4
4 to 6	40.5	36.2	-4.3
7 or more	23.1	24.7	+1.6
No limit	27.6	24.9	-2.7

In regard to pass/fail limitations, respondents were asked if pass/fail courses were restricted to electives. The 1992 respondents indicated that they were slightly more likely (3%) to restrict pass/fail grading to elective courses. About two-thirds of the schools responding indicated they prohibit students from opting to enroll in courses on a pass/fail basis in anything other than electives. The ratio of schools limiting pass/fail options to electives remained about the same as it was in 1982.

Of the institutions which responded they do not limit pass/fail grading to elective courses, 43% permit pass/fail in major courses. However, 35% of this category of respondents said it was not permissible for students to enroll in major courses on a pass/fail basis, and 22% did not respond.

The 1992 data suggest that school size appears to have no bearing on whether pass/fail may be used in major courses. However, when viewed by type of school (control and program type), 42 (75%) of the two-year public colleges allow major courses to be taken pass/fail. In contrast, 14 (36%) of the four-year private universities permit the use of pass/fail options in major courses. All other categories of institutions were divided about evenly in their responses to this question.

There have been some changes in the last ten years with regard to the minimum passing grade in the application of the pass/fail option. While close to one-third of the responding schools reported in both 1982 and 1992 that a grade of "C" is required for passing, the use of the "D" grade as a minimum passing grade has declined dramatically. The "D" grade was accepted in 46% of the responding colleges and universities in 1982, but only by 23% in 1992. Interestingly, the shift away from the "D" grade has gone in two directions at the same time. More schools are using the "C-" grade as the minimum now (15% in 1992) than in the past (7% in 1982). At the same time, an increasing number of schools are using the "D-" as the minimum passing grade (14% in 1992 in comparison with 6% in 1982). Also, an increase was noted in the percentage of respondents to the 1992 survey who indicated that it is the instructor who determines what qualifies as the minimum passing grade.

Table 18

What minimum grade represents a "pass," "credit," or "satisfactory" in a pass/fail course?

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
C	35.4	32.5	-2.9
C-	6.5	14.4	+7.9
D	45.7	22.7	-23.0
D-	6.9	13.9	+7.0
75+ *		11.1	
70		33.3	
65		5.6	
60		22.2	
50		22.2	
Below 50		5.6	
Instructor determines what qualifies as passing	3.8	13.9	+10.1
Other	1.8	2.3%	+0.5

* Data on numeric classifications for minimum passing grade in pass/fail courses was not reported in 1982.

A close examination of the data in Table 19 reveals that there has been a shift away from the practice of not recording "failing" grades in pass/fail courses since 1982. The shift has been universal in that institutions of all sizes and types have moved away from not recording failing marks in these courses. Overall, the reduction in not recording has dropped from 13% in 1982 to 7% in 1992. In shifting away from this practice of not including failing marks from pass/fail courses in a student's grade average, the percentage increase between those institutions which choose to record the grade and include it in the student averages was 41% in 1982 to 44% in 1992. The increase for institutions choosing to record the grade but not include it in the average rose 4% between 1982 and 1992.

Table 19

If a student "fails" (unsatisfactory, no credit, etc.) a course while using the student grading options (pass/fail), do you record the grade of "fail" or other similar symbol to denote a failure, on the student's permanent academic record?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes, and include it in the grade average	345	43.1
Yes, and do not include it in the grade average	403	50.3
No, not posted to the academic record	53	6.6
TOTAL	801	

On the 1992 survey, several questions were asked concerning the course auditing policies and practices of the respondents. These questions were not asked on the 1982 survey; therefore, no analysis of longitudinal data was possible for this grading practice.

When schools were asked if they permitted students to audit courses, 93% of all types of institutions reported allowing students to audit courses. However, only 74% of the two-year private institutions allow course auditing. When respondents were asked if audited courses were recorded on the transcript, the great majority of the schools (84%) indicated they do record the audited course on the transcript.

Respondents were also asked if students could obtain credit by examination for audited courses. Of the usable responses, 75% of the institutions reported they do not permit students to challenge for credit courses which they previously audited. However, as Table 20 shows, it is more likely for students to obtain credit by examination for audited courses in larger institutions.

Table 20

Can a student get credit by examination for the audited course?

SIZE OF INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE ALLOWING CREDIT BY EXAM FOR AUDITED COURSES
< 2,500	24.3
2,500-9,999	23.8
10,000-19,999	33.7
20,000+	60.3

INCOMPLETE COURSEWORK

Incomplete coursework is allowed in almost every institution responding to the 1992 survey (98%). The same percentage of institutions reported use of incompletes in 1982. When asked to specify the circumstances under which incompletes could be awarded, both the private and public four-year universities indicated that these grades were primarily awarded at the discretion of the faculty member (82%). However, among the four-year public and private colleges, only 76% of these institutions give incompletes at the discretion of the faculty member. A contrast between the two-year colleges was noted. Only 72% of the two-year private institutions allow the faculty member to make this determination, but 80% of the public institutions gave the instructor this authority.

The survey also asked if incompletes were awarded **only** for substantiated medical reasons or **only** if a majority of the course work was completed. However, a sizeable number of respondents completed this item incorrectly by answering yes to both categories of responses. On the other hand, it is safe to say that many fewer institutions limit themselves to the awarding of incompletes for **only** medical reasons or **only** when most of the coursework is complete. It is also possible to say that some schools recognize several circumstances under which the incomplete grade can be given.

The 1982 survey asked respondents about deadlines for resolution of incomplete courses. However, the results were confusing because semester and quarter were not differentiated in the data. Therefore, no attempt should be made to compare the results in table format between the 1982 and 1992 data. The 1992 survey employed the concept of "term" which allowed the respondent to answer the question without having to choose between semester or quarter. However, Table 21 shows that it is still possible to make some comparisons between the two data sets.

Table 21

Is there a deadline for "incomplete" grade resolution?

RESPONSE	1982		1992	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
End of next term	458	29.8	461	33.3
One academic year	26	1.7	91	6.6
One calendar year	171	11.1	95	6.9
Set by professor	45	2.9	49	3.5

Three-quarters of the 1992 survey participants responded in one of the categories listed above. The remainder of institutions set a deadline for solving incomplete grades at the mid-point of the following term (8%) or set a deadline somewhere between the fourth to sixth week of the next term (17%).

Finally, with regard to the incomplete grade, respondents were asked to indicate what the final grade would be if the student did not finish the work required to resolve the incomplete by the specified deadline. Table 22 clearly shows that during the past ten years, there has been a significant increase in the number of institutions which note a course failure when the incomplete is not resolved in a timely fashion. The percentage difference between 1982 and 1992 is 8%. It should be noted that the 1982 survey contained several other categories, which were all combined into the "other" category in the table and not included on the 1992 instrument.

Table 22

If the "incomplete" grade is not resolved by the deadline, or there is no deadline, what is the permanent grade of record?

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
Failure	68.0	76.4	+8.4
Remains incomplete	11.9	11.2	-0.7
No record/no credit	3.7	1.3	-2.4
Withdrawal	1.5	1.3	-0.2
Other	14.9	9.8	-5.1

TIME LIMITS

The survey also asked respondents questions concerning the deadlines for discontinuing course enrollment (drop) without having the attempt being recorded on the transcript. The data from the 1982 and 1992 surveys reveal that the most frequent deadline has remained within the first two weeks of the term. It has only increased by 4% in the last ten years. However, when one combines the figures for the first four week categories, the 1982 study found 81% of the responding institutions allowed dropping up to this time. In 1992, 76% of the responding institutions allowed it up until this point in the semester. This reflects a decrease of 12% in the number of schools having their deadline between the third and fourth weeks of the term. Interestingly, there was also an increase of 4% in the number of schools which record the discontinuance and consider it a "withdrawal."

The 1992 survey added two categories to the list of possible deadlines. The first deadline added was "the mid-point of the term." Seventy-two or 5% of the institutions reported this point as their deadline for permitting a student to drop a course without the course appearing on the record. The other new deadline category was "prior to the start of the next term." Only 15 schools or 1% reported this deadline. In an effort to report with more precision, the category of "other" was removed from the 1992 survey, and respondents were asked to mark the category most representative of their practice.

Table 23

Under ordinary circumstances, what is the last date in a term (semester or quarter) that a student can discontinue a course without having it recorded on the permanent academic record? (Please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline.)

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
End of 1st week or less	24.6	27.7	+3.1
End of 2nd week or less	26.8	30.8	+4.0
End of 3rd week or less	11.4	9.9	-1.5
End of 4th week or less	17.4	7.3	-10.1
End of 5th week or less	3.3	2.4	-0.9
End of 6th week or less	4.0	3.0	-1.0
End of 7th week or less	1.2	1.8	+0.6
End of 8th week or less	3.3	2.6	-0.7
After 8th week	7.2	4.9	-2.3
Always recorded (shows as a withdrawal)	0.4	3.9	+3.5
Mid-point of the term *	-.-	4.8	-.-
Prior to the start of the next term *	-.-	1.0	-.-
Other **	0.4	-.-	-.-

* 1992 survey only
** 1982 survey only

Respondents were asked to indicate what deadline came closest to theirs with respect to permitting grade changes in courses other than those in which an incomplete had been awarded. In the 1982 study, the majority of the institutions (810 or 52%) responded in the "no limit" category. However, the 1992 survey attempted to determine more precisely what was meant by "no limit" and the current instrument divides this category was into three potential responses: "no limit" per se; "no limit, but before graduation;" and, "no limit, but requires approval of academic officer." Table 24 clearly shows that a larger majority of respondents choose the general category of no limit, increasing from 52% in 1982 to 57% in 1992.

In further analysis of the 1992 data, it was found that of the responding institutions which have no limit for grade changes, but do exercise some form of control over the process, either an academic officer must approve the change (31%) or the grade change must be made before graduation (10%). However, another 15% of the respondents stipulated that grade changes must be made before graduation.

Further comparison between the 1982 and 1992 data reveals several other changes have occurred in policies relating to grade changes. In 1992, 13% of the responding institutions allowed grade changes to take place at the discretion of the dean or

professor. However, only 2% of the respondents indicated that this was the case in 1982. Further, in 1982 the "one calendar year" deadline had a response rate of 7%, but the "one academic year" deadline had a response rate of less than 1%. In 1992, the responses in these two categories were found to be exactly equal at 5%. This seems to suggest a shift away from the calendar year deadline toward the academic year deadline.

Table 24

What is the time limit beyond which you will *ordinarily* not allow a grade change (excluding the removal of incomplete grades)? (Please indicate the response which best approximates your policy.)

RESPONSE	PERCENT	
	1982	1992
Undifferentiated, no limit	52.1	10.5
No limit, but before graduation *	-.-	15.1
No limit, but requires approval of academic officer	-.-	31.0
Sub-total	52.1	56.6

* 1992 category only

Distinctions in "no limit" category were made in this survey.

RESPONSE	PERCENT		DIFFERENCE
	1982	1992	
Discretion of dean	1.2	8.3	+7.1
Discretion of professor	0.4	4.6	+4.2
Not after grades mailed	0.7	0.4	-0.3
Not after grades posted	1.5	1.1	-0.4
Prior to end of 2nd week of next term	2.5	2.9	+0.4
Prior to end of 4th week of next term	4.4	3.0	-1.4
Prior to end of 6th week of next term	3.2	2.0	-1.2
Prior to end of 8th week of next term	2.1	1.1	-1.0
Mid-point of next term *	-.-	1.6	-.-
End of next term	10.9	9.1	-1.8
One academic year	0.4	4.5	+4.1
One calendar year	7.1	4.5	-2.6
Other **	13.5	-.-	-.-

* 1992 survey only
** Included six months, three calendar years, and other in 1982 survey

REPEATED COURSES FOR GRADE IMPROVEMENT

One of the items contained in both the 1971 and 1982 grading surveys was how repeated courses are handled. The survey participants were asked to respond to five related repeated course questions in the 1992 study. They are listed below:

Are students permitted to repeat courses they have already taken at your institution to better their grades?

In calculating grade averages, how do you accommodate repeated course grades?

Do you allow additional graduation credit for a course repeated for a better grade?

How many times can a single course be repeated?

Has your institution made any changes in its repeated course policies during the past five years?

As the associated tables below reveal, the vast majority of all types of institutions permit students to repeat courses to better their grades. This was similar to the findings of both the 1971 and 1982 studies on this topic.

Table 25

Are students permitted to repeat courses they have already taken at your institution to better their grades?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	1,381	86.3
No	78	4.9
No response	142	8.8

Of the "Yes" responses, the following conditions were stipulated:

CONDITION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Can only repeat failure	98	13.2
Cannot be a course required for the major	1	0.1
Can only be a course required for the major	8	0.5
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "C" (or equivalent) or lower	80	5.0
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "D" (or equivalent) or lower	371	23.2
Can repeat any course for a better grade	823	51.4
No response	220	13.8

The 1982 AACRAO Study indicated that 7% of the institutions responding did not offer students a repeat option through which they could better their grades. Therefore, based on the 1992 data, it may be inferred that the normative practice of permitting students to repeat a course to improve their grades has been increasing as a matter of academic policy. The majority of insti-

tutions responding in 1992 indicated they allow students to repeat a course to better their grades and have no stipulations on which courses may be repeated for grade improvement. However, 23% of the institutions which responded that a student could repeat a course to raise their grade also indicated that the first attempt must have earned a "D" grade or lower. This figure was up from the 17% of the institutions which responded to the 1982 survey and reported that students could only repeat a course if the first grade was a "D" or lower.

Table 26

In calculating grade averages, how do you accommodate repeated course grades?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Both are calculated in the averaging of grades	281	17.6
Only the most recent grade is included in the averaging of grades	666	41.6
Only the highest grade is included in the averaging of grades	377	23.5
Other	106	6.6
No response	171	10.7

Clearly, the data from the 1992 survey reveal that the greatest percentage of institutions are including the most recently earned grade in grade point average computations. The reported results of the 1982 survey combined the "most recent grade" and the "highest grade earned" categories. Utilizing this approach to data analysis, the 1992 survey found 65% of the responding institutions replaced grades instead of averaging them. The 1982 survey results indicated that 68% of the respondents used repeat course grades to replace other attempts. Interestingly, the percentage of institutions averaging repeated course grades with those from previous attempts dropped from 24% in 1992 to 18% in 1992.

Table 27

Do you allow additional graduation credit for a course repeated to better the grade?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	1,312	81.9
Yes	0	0.0
No response	289	18.1

Clearly, this was a question that had little need to be asked in 1992. Presently, institutions do not allow additional graduation credit for a repeated course. However, the question was asked in order to maintain the longitudinal integrity between the 1982 and 1992 survey instruments. In the 1982 AACRAO Study, 93% of the respondents reported their institutions did not allow additional graduation credit for a repeated course.

Table 28

How many times can a single course be repeated?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
One time	230	14.4
Two times	134	8.4
Three times	85	5.3
Unlimited	961	60.0
No response	191	11.9

The vast majority of responding institutions do not have a limit on the number of times a single course may be repeated for improving a grade. However, the number of institutions which limit the attempts at repeating a course are not insignificant. On the 1982 survey, a corresponding question was not asked; therefore, there is no comparative data available for this item.

Table 29

Has your institution made any changes in its repeated course policies during the past five years?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	1,180	73.7
Yes	0	0.0
No response	420	26.3

These figures imply that repeated course policies have stabilized considerably since the 1982 AACRAO Study. At that time, 14% of the responding institutions indicated that they had made some type of change in their repeated course policies during the previous five years. One can assume that some percentage of the institutions which did not respond to this item had probably made a change in their policies, but failed to report it on the survey. The one institution which did indicate a change in its repeated course policy during the past five-year period reported implementing an averaging policy for repeated courses.

GRADING POLICY ISSUES

This section was not contained on either the 1971 or 1982 surveys. It was included in the 1992 survey in an effort to determine if institutions (at the undergraduate level) are using different grading systems between schools or academic units or have differing deadlines between units. In addition, it was hoped that this section would reveal which governance bodies within institutions establish grading policies.

Table 30

If your institution has several undergraduate schools (arts and sciences, engineering, business, etc.), are there different grading systems and grades for different schools?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	682	42.6
Yes	40	2.5
Not applicable (only one school at the undergraduate level)	750	46.8
No response	129	8.1

This data indicates that almost all institutions are using a common grading system when there are multiple schools and colleges at the undergraduate level. Only close to 3% of the respondents who had more than one undergraduate school reported they had different grading systems for the various units.

Table 31

If your institution has several undergraduate schools, are there different deadlines and time limits established for the school with respect to the submission of grades, grade changes, make-up of incompletes, etc.?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	668	41.7
Yes	32	2.0
Not applicable (only one school at the undergraduate level)	737	46.0
No response	164	10.2

Interpretation of this data shows that for those institutions with multiple academic units at the undergraduate level, the vast majority have common policies regarding deadlines and time limits associated with collection of grades, grade changes, and make-up of incompletes. Only 2% of the respondents indicated they had varying policies from school to school with regard to time limits and deadlines.

Table 32

Who determines grade policy at your institution?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Academic administration (including academic vice president and deans)	411	25.7
University-wide faculty governance group	401	25.0
School-wide faculty governance group	240	15.0
University-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students	240	15.0
School-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students	150	9.4
No response	159	9.9

The responses received to this question are interesting since they indicate that there was no definitive group among the institutions surveyed that determines grading policy issues. Clearly, establishment of grading policy and related requirements is determined in participative forums more often than by being mandated by academic administration (a ratio of almost 3 to 1). However, a large number of the responding institutions did report that the determination of grading policy was left to academic administrators (academic vice presidents and deans).

ACADEMIC BANKRUPTCY AND FORGIVENESS POLICIES

On the 1982 survey, no specific questions were asked regarding "forgiveness" policies for past, poor academic records. However, this is a practice which has become more prevalent among institutions in the past two decades. Three questions were asked to ascertain the breadth by which such policies have grown and the various conditions that institutions utilize in permitting leniency (forgiveness) policies.

Table 33

Does your institution have an academic bankruptcy or forgiveness policy?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	941	58.8
Yes	406	25.4
No, but considering one	127	7.9
No response	127	7.9

Although a majority of the responding institutions reported they did not have a "forgiveness" or "bankruptcy" policy, a sizable number of institutions have apparently adopted such policies and another large group of schools are considering implementing some form of "forgiveness" policy.

Table 34

Academic bankruptcy or forgiveness can apply if a student: (multiple responses were accepted)

RESPONSE	NUMBER
Has obtained a certain age	9
Has not attended **any** other institution for a set period of time	94
Has not attended **this** institution for a set period of time	218
Has maintained good academic standing at **this** institution after re-enrollment	96

Table 35

The bankruptcy or forgiveness policy is implemented by:

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Giving the student a new start by removing all courses from a specific time period from the previous record	58	3.7
Removing only courses below "C" (or passing) from the previous record	26	1.6
Removing only failing courses from the previous record	11	0.7
Keeping all courses from the previous record, but not counting them in cumulative totals	162	10.2
Keeping all courses from the previous record and only counting those courses which were above passing into cumulative totals	60	3.8
Other	95	6.0
No response	1,184	74.0

The above two tables are revealing and represent trends in the use of academic forgiveness or bankruptcy policies. No conclusions are drawn from the above data, but it will be interesting to note how responses to these inquiries change when next reported.

GRADUATION HONORS

Questions in this section of the report were asked in an effort to determine how many institutions awarded "honors" associated with the undergraduate degree. In addition, these items were expanded from the previous study in order to determine what was the grade point average or percentage of class used to award the different levels of honors. The 1982 AACRAO Study found that 91% of the responding institutions which did award some type of honors in conjunction with the conferring of the degree based the award on a predetermined grade point average. The 1982 AACRAO Study also found that 5% of the responding institutions used a percentage of graduating class for determination of honors and 4% indicated they used some other basis to give graduation honors.

Table 36

Does your institution calculate and award graduation honors ("highest honors," "summa cum laude," etc.)?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	171	10.7
Yes	1,312	81.9
No response	118	7.4

Table 37

Honors Based on Grade Point Averages:
Minimum grade average for highest honors, summa cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
3.90 or above	548
3.80-3.89	334
3.75-3.79	144
3.74 or below	72

Minimum grade average for high honors, magna cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
3.80 or above	115
3.75-3.79	293
3.60-3.74	394
3.50-3.59	236
3.49 or below	37

Minimum grade average for honors, cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
3.75 or above	41
3.60-3.74	77
3.50-3.59	520
3.40-3.49	156
3.25-3.39	228
3.00-3.24	112
2.99 or below	5

Table 38

Honors Based on a Percentage of the Graduating Class
Percentage of students used for calculation of highest honors, summa cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
5% or less	161
6%-10%	23
11%-15%	3
More than 15%	7

Percentage of students used for calculation of high honors, magna cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
5% or less	80
6%-10%	79
11%-15%	21
16%-20%	8
More than 20%	9

Percentage of students used for calculation of high honors, cum laude, etc.

RESPONSE	NUMBER
10% or less	96
10%-19%	77
20%-24%	25
25%-30%	3
More than 30%	16

Table 39

Approximately what percent of your students who received undergraduate degrees in the past year earned graduation honors? (All levels - highest honors, high honors, honors, etc.)

RESPONSE	NUMBER
10% or less	307
11%-15%	256
16%-20%	194
21%-25%	147
26%-30%	105
More than 30%	134

Table 40

Do you include transfer grades when calculating graduation honors?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	870	54.3
Yes	321	20.0
Yes, but with qualifications	112	7.0
No response	298	18.6

Table 41

Has your institution made any significant changes in its graduation honors criteria during the past five years?

RESPONSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
No	1,099	69.2
Made more stringent	162	10.2
Made more lenient	35	2.2
No response	293	18.4

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study

CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the data from the 1992 AACRAO Study, and after making comparisons between the new information and the data collected in previous AACRAO studies, the following conclusions are offered:

First, colleges and universities which utilize four-point undergraduate grading systems are increasingly making those systems more detailed and specific. The data revealed that a significantly greater number of the 1992 respondents, in comparison with the 1982 respondents, employ a plus and/or minus, combined letter numeric, or non-letter grading system instead of using a simple letter only grading system. This is consistent with Quann's (1987) expectation that more institutions would implement plus and/or minus grading systems as a response to grade inflation. It may also reflect the concerns expressed by Cole (1993), Grieves (1982), and Singleton and Smith (1978) which implied that a means of more accurately and specifically reflecting a student's performance is needed.

Second, there is significant movement toward treating failure grades as penalty marks by assigning, recording, and computing such grades in the student's grade point average. While Scott (1975) and Winsor (1977) both noted that institutions had stopped using failure marks at one time, Quann (1984) indicated that this practice would likely be discontinued as another response to grade inflation. The data from the 1992 AACRAO Study were consistent with this assumption.

Third, the practice of including transfer grades in grade point average calculations and in making honors determinations has declined considerably between 1982 and 1992. As early as 1972, Baird and Feister cautioned against using transfer grades in making decisions about students. Quann (1984) predicted that fewer institutions would include these grades in average and honors calculations in their attempts to limit grade inflation. The data support this conclusion.

Fourth, colleges and universities are decreasingly allowing students to enroll in courses on a pass/fail basis. Davidson (1975) and Warren (1975) both indicated that pass/fail grading was a primary source of grade inflation. According to Bromely, Crow, and Gibson (1978), discontinuing this grading option would prevent students from using it to camouflage their actual performance. While a decrease in the number of institutions allowing pass/fail was found when analyzing all the responses, one should note that small private universities (those with enrollments under 2,500 students) reported a significant increased usage of the pass/fail grading option. This increase may reflect a desire at these institutions for students to engage in academic exploration outside of their major area of study (Quann 1974).

Fifth, there is significant movement toward institutions replacing repeated course grades with the grade from the most recent attempt or the grade from the best attempt. The literature on academic bankruptcy may explain the reasons why the trend is toward replacing repeated course grades. As noted earlier, academic bankruptcy, or forgiveness, allows a student the opportunity to improve his/her academic standing by disregarding a portion of the student's previous academic record (Quann 1984). Replacing the repeated course grade would best help the student to improve his/her standing. Institutions have begun to disregard prior academic performance as a means of attracting and retaining adult students (Ross 1989) and as an acknowledgement of grade inflation and the changing values of grades over time (Weinstein 1981). The movement toward replacing grades instead of averaging them may also be indicative of an awareness that the same course does not necessarily contain the same content if taught and

evaluated by different instructors. If this assumption is valid, then there may be serious implications for higher education in terms of the quality of educational expectations and experiences of students (Singer 1993).

Sixth, colleges and universities are trying to make their honors criteria more stringent by basing the determinations for such honors on a percentage of graduating class rather than on a pre-determined grade point average. This practice was recommended by Cook (1985) and projected by Quann (1984). Institutions utilizing percentage of graduating class may be able to restore some significance to these distinctions which has been lost due to grade inflation (Bolin 1975).

Finally, one should note that while the 1992 AACRAO Survey has revealed significant changes in several grading practices, the pace of change has varied according to institutional size. The data from the 1992 study indicate that larger institutions, those with enrollments of 20,000 or more students, are the slowest to change. This phenomenon may be explained by the simple fact that in these larger institutions there are simply more people, specifically more faculty, to be consulted before academic policy changes are implemented. Steeples (1990) cites cultural resistance to change and basic inertia in larger institutions as two other reasons why change is often slow in the academy.

The results of this study indicate that if colleges and universities are willing to make changes in their grading systems and grading practices, they may be able to improve those systems to the benefit of all who are affected by them. The ability of faculty to communicate to students their evaluations of student performance is enhanced by a more reliable and detailed institutional grading structure. Singleton and Smith (1978) noted how the use of a more specified grading system increases the predictive validity of grade point averages. Restoring public confidence in the ability of the transcript to reflect the potential of prospective graduate students or employees may also be a benefit of improved grading systems. Some of the adverse consequences of grade inflation, including the depreciation of academic honors, may also be avoided by the use of better grading practices in higher education.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Upon conclusion of the distribution and analysis of the results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey of Undergraduate Grading and Grading Practices, the Ad Hoc Committee which conducted the survey would like to make the following recommendations for future studies:

- Prior to the distribution of future surveys, the survey instruments themselves should be assessed for reliability and validity. External validation of the survey, through comparison with other instruments that assess grades and grading practices, is suggested to ensure that the instrument actually measures what it is intended to measure.
- Once future surveys are distributed, they should be followed by a second mailing encouraging potential respondents to complete the instrument. The 1992 survey only had a 70% return rate in comparison with the 82% return rate of the 1982 surveys. A follow-up mailing may have helped to improve the rate of completion.
- A tape copy of the data from the 1992 survey should be produced and maintained at the AACRAO Office in order to facilitate longitudinal analysis in the future. Also, if possible the data from the 1971 and 1982 surveys should be entered into an electronic data file in order to make future comparisons of data simpler.
- The instrument itself should be standardized and maintain the same general format in order to facilitate longitudinal data analysis. Some problems arose during the data analysis phase of 1992 study because of significant differences between the current instrument and the one used in 1982.
- While the 1992 researchers did not fully analyze the data by calendar type, it is suggested that this analysis be completed in future studies.
- Other possible areas for expanded analysis in future studies are listed below:
- More attention to how grading practices or policies are related to academic actions (probations and dismissals) would be appropriate in future studies.
- A cross tabulation of the various grading systems (letter only, plus and minus, etc.) by the other items on the survey might provide further insights as to how and why institutions implement and operate their grading policies.
- An analysis of how grade processing is handled in institutions with multiple grading systems would be interesting.
- An assessment of professional and graduate school grading policies and practices is called for in future studies.

AACRAO should continue its research on grades and grading in the future. Intervals of ten years remain appropriate for this study.

APPENDIX A

AACRAO Survey of Undergraduate Grades and Grading Practices and Related Correspondence

AACRAO

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

One Dupont Circle, NW • Suite 330 • Washington, DC 20036-1171
(202) 293-9161 • FAX (202) 872-8857

Board of Directors

President
Gary L. Smith
University of Missouri-Columbia

Past President
Charles W. McKinney
University of California-Santa Barbara

President Elect
Jeffery M. Tanner
Brigham Young University

Vice President for International Education
Sylvia K. Higashi
University of Hawaii-Manoa

Vice President for Registration and Records Management
Frederick A. Fresh
Clark Atlanta University

Vice President for Professional Development, Research and Publications
Kathy G. Plance
Louisiana State University

Vice President for Enrollment Management, Admissions and Financial Aid
Stanley E. Henderson
Western Michigan University

Vice President for Regional Associations and International Affairs
John F. Dienhoff
The University of Rhode Island

Secretary-Treasurer
Paul H. Anderson
Furman University

Executive Director
Wayne R. Becraft

Assistant Executive Director
Laurine D. Robinson

1993 Annual Meeting
April 18-23, 1993
Orlando, Florida

1994 Annual Meeting
April 17-22, 1994
Boston, Massachusetts

August, 1992

Dear AACRAO Colleague,

Enclosed is the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) **Survey of Undergraduate Grading and Grading Practices**. This letter is being sent to the institutional contact person listed in AACRAO's membership records. Could you please direct the survey to the person at your institution who can complete the questionnaire.

This study has been approved by the Board of Directors of AACRAO and will result in a new AACRAO publication which will update similar studies undertaken in 1971 and 1982. A copy of the new publication will be mailed to all member institutions sometime in early 1993. Results of the study will, also, be presented at the AACRAO annual meeting in April, 1993, in Orlando, Florida.

Please follow the directions listed in the "Instructions" portion of the form. The **DEADLINE** for return of the form is **OCTOBER 1, 1992**. To help insure the statistical accuracy of this important survey, please take the time to complete the survey and mail it in the enclosed envelope by the deadline.

Thank you very much on behalf of AACRAO's ad hoc **Committee on Grading and Grading Practices**.

Sincerely,
FOR THE COMMITTEE:

Herbert J. Riley, Chair

Members:
Mr. Robert Checca
Ms. Tara Singer
Mr. Donald Worthington

hjr/

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS (AACRAO)

SURVEY of UNDERGRADUATE GRADING and GRADING PRACTICES

INSTRUCTIONS

Please read the following instructions before completing your responses:

1. Please note that this survey is limited to the grading practices which exist at your institution for ***undergraduate*** students. If your institution is graduate or professional only, complete items 1, 2, and 3.
2. If differences in grading practices exist among colleges/schools within your institution, please answer the questions based on the policies adopted by your ***liberal arts*** (arts and sciences) academic unit.
3. Unique features of the grading system of an institution may make exact responses difficult to some of the questions. Please answer each question with a response that ***most nearly*** describes the situation at your institution. If none of the listed responses are close to the policies of your institution, please do not respond to that question. However, if a response is ***close*** to the policy, please select that answer.
4. Upon completion, please place in the return envelope and mail to:

Herbert J. Riley
University Registrar
SUNY-Binghamton
Binghamton, NY 13902-6002

WRONG MARKS ⊘ ⊗ ◒ ⊙ RIGHT MARK ●

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

Institutional Information

1. **PRINT the name of your institution:**

2. **In what state (or country, if not U.S.A.) is your institution located? (If not USA or Canada, indicate "Country other than USA or Canada".)**

○ Alabama	○ Iowa	○ New Hampshire	○ Texas
○ Alaska	○ Kansas	○ New Jersey	○ Utah
○ Arizona	○ Kentucky	○ New Mexico	○ Vermont
○ Arkansas	○ Louisiana	○ New York	○ Virginia
○ California	○ Maine	○ North Carolina	○ Washington
○ Colorado	○ Maryland	○ North Dakota	○ West Virginia
○ Connecticut	○ Massachusetts	○ Ohio	○ Wisconsin
○ Delaware	○ Michigan	○ Oklahoma	○ Wyoming
○ Florida	○ Minnesota	○ Oregon	○ Canada
○ Georgia	○ Mississippi	○ Pennsylvania	○ Country other than USA or Canada
○ Hawaii	○ Missouri	○ Rhode Island	
○ Idaho	○ Montana	○ South Carolina	
○ Illinois	○ Nebraska	○ South Dakota	
○ Indiana	○ Nevada	○ Tennessee	

3. **Is your institution a:**
   - ○ Two year public community or junior college
   - ○ Two year private community or junior college
   - ○ Four year public college
   - ○ Four year private college
   - ○ Four year public university
   - ○ Four year private university
   - ○ Graduate or professional only (no undergraduates). If this response is answered, no additional information is requested. Thank you for your cooperation.

4. **Indicate the size of your institution based on FALL 1991 total student enrollment. (Use headcount, not FTE - do not include extension, correspondence, etc.)**

○ Less than 500	○ 2,500 - 4,999	○ More than 20,000
○ 500 - 999	○ 5,000 - 9,999	
○ 1,000 - 2,499	○ 10,000 - 19,999	

Fold Here

5. **What type of academic calendar is currently used by your institution?**
   - ○ Early Semester (Fall ends before Christmas)
   - ○ Traditional Semester (Break at Christmas and complete Fall after the Break.
   - ○ Term or Quarter
   - ○ Trimester
   - ○ 4-1-4
   - ○ Other

Grading Systems

6. **Which of the following grading systems best describes your current grading system?**

6a. **Letter and/or numeric using the 4.0 system. (If you use an "A+" and count the value higher than 4.0, answer one of these questions). If yes, does your grading system have:**
   - ○ Letter grades only (no pluses or minuses).
   - ○ Letter grades with both pluses and minuses (or equivalents).
   - ○ Letter grades with just pluses (or equivalents).

Fold Here

   - ○ Letter grades with just minuses (or equivalents).
   - ○ Numeric grades only (i.e., 2.3, 3.0, 3.7, etc.
   - ○ Both letter and numeric grades

6b. **Letter and/or numeric grades indicating values different from a 4.0 scale. If yes, does your system have:**
   - ○ Letter grades (with or without pluses or minuses) where the value for the highest grade is different than 4.0 (i.e., highest grade has value of 3.0).
   - ○ Numerics with 99 (or 100) as the highest value.
   - ○ Letter grades indicating a percentage, or similar range, i.e., A = 90 - 100. B = 80 - 89. C = 70 - 79, etc.
   - ○ Combination of numerics and letter grades.
   - ○ Only narratives which cannot be converted to numeric or letter equivalent.

Trans-Optic® by NCS EM-46452:321 A2400 Printed in U.S.A.

Page One

7. **Have you had substantive changes in your grading system in the last five years?**

- ○ No
- ○ Yes *If Yes,*
  - ○ Added pluses and/or minuses
  - ○ Went to letter grades from numeric
  - ○ Went to letter grades from a narrative evaluation
  - ○ Went to numeric grades from letter grades
  - ○ Went to numeric grades from a narrative evaluation
  - ○ Went to narrative evaluation from letter grades
  - ○ Went to narrative evaluation from numeric grades
  - ○ Went to percentages from letter grades
  - ○ Went to percentages from narrative evaluation

8. **Do you anticipate any substantive changes in your grading system within the next five years?**

- ○ No
- ○ Yes

If Yes,
- ○ Add pluses and/or minuses
- ○ Go to letter grades from numeric
- ○ Go to letter grades from a narrative evaluation
- ○ Go to numeric grades from letter grades
- ○ Go to numeric grades from a narrative evaluation
- ○ Go to narrative evaluation from letter grades
- ○ Go to narrative evaluation from numeric grades
- ○ Go to percentages from letter grades
- ○ Go to percentages from narrative evaluation

9. **Which of the following best describes your policy on "failing" grades?**

- ○ They are assigned and recorded on the student's permanent academic record and included in the grade average.
- ○ They are assigned and recorded on the student's permanent academic record, but not included in the grade average.
- ○ They are assigned, but not recorded on the student's permanent academic record.
- ○ They are assigned, but recorded on the students permanent academic record as something other than a symbol that would represent a failure
- ○ They are not assigned, but a record of attempt is kept.
- ○ They are not assigned and no record of attempt is kept.

Grade Average Computations

10. **When determining a student's cumulative grade average, does your institution:**

- ○ Enter all grades including transfer work in the calculations
- ○ Use only the grades earned at your institution

Student Grading Options

For the purposes of questions 11 - 17, the student grading options designations include courses that, at the student option, may be graded on a pass/fail or similar basis.

11. **Does your institution permit students to opt to take courses using the "pass/fail" (or similar) grading option?**

○ No (go to question # 18) ○ Yes

12. **How many courses per term (quarter or semester) can a student take using this student grading option?**

○ One ○ Three ○ No limit
○ Two ○ Four or more

13. **How many courses during an undergraduate academic career can a student take using this student grading option?**

○ 1 - 3 ○ 7 - 9 ○ No limit
○ 4 - 6 ○ 10 or more

14. **Are the courses which can be taken using this grading option limited to elective courses?**

○ Yes ○ No

15. **If "No" to question #14, can the courses be taken to satisfy courses within the major?**

○ Yes ○ No ○ Not applicable

16. **What minimum grade represents a "Pass", "Credit" or "Satisfactory" specified in question #11?**

If letter grades:
○ C ○ D+ ○ D-
○ C- ○ D ○ Instructor determines

If numeric grades:
○ 75 or above ○ 60 ○ Below 50
○ 70 ○ 55
○ 65 ○ 50

17. **If a student "fails" (unsatisfactory, no credit, etc.) a course while using the student grading options in #11, do you record the grade of "fail" or other similar symbol to denote a failure, on the student's permanent academic record?**

- ○ Yes, and include it in the grade average
- ○ Yes, and do not include it in the grade average
- ○ No, not posted to the academic record

18. **Does your institution permit students to register for courses on an "audit" basis?**

○ Yes ○ No

19. **Are courses that are audited recorded on the transcript?**

○ Yes ○ No

20. **Can a student get credit by examination for the audited course?**

○ Yes ○ No

Incomplete Coursework

21. **Does your institution allow students to receive "INCOMPLETE" grades?**

- ○ No (go to question #24)
- ○ Yes (answer all that apply)
  - ○ At the discretion of the faculty member
  - ○ Only awarded for substantiated medical reasons
  - ○ Only if a majority of the coursework has been completed

22. Is there a deadline for "INCOMPLETE" grade resolution?

- ○ No
- ○ Yes. ***If yes:*** (please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline)
  - ○ By the end of the next full term (semester or quarter)
  - ○ By the end of one full academic year
  - ○ By the end of one calendar year
  - ○ Prior to graduation
  - ○ By the end of the mid-point of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the second week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the fourth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the sixth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the eighth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the tenth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the twelfth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the fourteenth week of the next term
  - ○ By the end of the first week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the second week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the fourth week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the sixth week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the eighth week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the tenth week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the twelfth week after the term ends
  - ○ By the end of the fourteenth week after the term ends
  - ○ Set by the professor

23. If the "INCOMPLETE" grade is not resolved by the deadline, or there is no deadline, what is the permanent grade of record?

- ○ Failure (whatever symbol denotes "failure")
- ○ Remains an "INCOMPLETE"
- ○ No record/no credit, etc.
- ○ Course withdrawal (appears on the record as a "Withdrawal")
- ○ Other

Time Limits

24. Under ordinary circumstances, what is the last date in a term (semester or quarter) that a student can discontinue a course without having it recorded on the permanent academic record? (Please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline)

- ○ End of the first week or less
- ○ End of the second week
- ○ End of the third week
- ○ End of the fourth week
- ○ End of the fifth week
- ○ End of the sixth week
- ○ End of the seventh week
- ○ End of the eighth week
- ○ After the eighth week
- ○ Mid-point of the term
- ○ Always recorded (shows as a course withdrawal)
- ○ Prior to the next term starting

25. What is the time limit beyond which you will ordinarily not allow a grade change (excluding the removal of incomplete grades)? (Please indicate the response which best approximates your policy)

- ○ No time limit, but prior to graduation
- ○ No time limit
- ○ No time limit, but always requires approval of academic officer (Dean or Dean's designee or above)
- ○ Discretion of Dean or designee
- ○ Discretion of the professor
- ○ Not after grades are mailed
- ○ Not after grades are posted to the academic record
- ○ Before the end of the second week of classes of the next term
- ○ Before the end of the fourth week of classes of the next term
- ○ Before the end of the sixth week of classes of the next term
- ○ Before the end of the eighth week of classes of the next term
- ○ Before mid-point of the next term
- ○ Before the end of the next full academic term
- ○ One full academic year
- ○ One full calendar year

Repeated Courses for Grade Improvement

26. Are students permitted to repeat courses they have already taken at your institution to better their grades?

- ○ No (go to question #31)
- ○ Yes. ***If yes,*** (please indicate the response which best approximates your policy)
  - ○ Can only repeat failures
  - ○ Cannot be a course required for the major
  - ○ Can only be a course required for the major
  - ○ Can only be a course where the first attempt was a "C" (or equivalent) or lower
  - ○ Can only be a course where the first attempt was a "D" (or equivalent) or lower
  - ○ Can repeat any course for a better grade

27. In calculating grade average, how do you accommodate repeated course grades?

- ○ Both are calculated in the averaging of grades
- ○ Only the most recent grade is included in the averaging of grades
- ○ Only the highest grades are included in the averaging of grades (In the case of the same grade, only one is used in the average)
- ○ Other

28. Do you allow additional graduation credit for a course repeated to better the grade?

○ No ○ Yes

29. How many times can a single course be repeated?

- ○ Once
- ○ Twice
- ○ Three times
- ○ Unlimited

30. Has your institution made any changes in its repeated course policies during the past five years?

○ No ○ Yes. ***If yes:***

- ○ To average all attempts
- ○ To include only the most recent attempt in the grade average
- ○ To include only the highest grade in the grade average
- ○ Other

Grading Policy Issues

31. If your institution has several undergraduate schools (arts and sciences, engineering, business, nursing, etc.), are there different grading systems and grades for different schools?

○ No ○ Yes ○ Not applicable (only one school at the undergraduate level)

32. If your institution has several different undergraduate schools (see above), are there different deadlines and time limits established for the school with respect to submission of grades, grades changes, make-up of incompletes, etc.?

○ No ○ Yes ○ Not applicable (only one school at the undergraduate level)

33. Who determines grade policy at your institution?

○ Academic administration (including VP for Academic Affairs and Deans)

○ University-wide faculty governance group
○ School-wide faculty governance group
○ University-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students
○ School-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students

Academic Bankruptcy and Forgiveness Policies

34. Does your institution have an academic bankruptcy or forgiveness policy?

○ Yes ○ No, not considering one (Skip to #37) ○ No, but considering one (Skip to #37)

35. Academic bankruptcy or forgiveness can apply if a student: (mark all that apply)

○ Has obtained a certain age
○ Has not attended any other institution for a set period of time
○ Has not attended this institution for a set period of time
○ Has maintained good academic standing at this institution after reenrollment
○ Other

36. The bankruptcy or forgiveness policy is implemented by:

○ Giving the student a new start by removing all courses from a specific time period from the previous record
○ Removing only courses below "C" (or passing) from the previous record
○ Removing only failing courses from the previous record
○ Keeping all courses from the previous record, but not counting them in cumulative totals
○ Keeping all courses from the previous record and only counting those courses which were above passing into cumulative totals
○ Other

Graduation Honors

37. Does your institution calculate and award graduation honors ("Highest Honors", "Summa Cum Laude", etc.)?

Please continue at top of next column. . .

37. Continued . . .

○ No (You have completed the survey. Please return the survey. Thank you very much)

○ Yes (please indicate the range within which the minimum falls for each category)

If "Yes" and you calculate honors based on grade average, answer question #38 - #40. If you calculate honors based on percentages, answer questions #41 - #43.

Based on grade averages (If you answer 38-40, go to question 44)

38. Minimum grade average for Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

○ 3.9 or above ○ 3.8 - 3.89 ○ 3.75 - 3.79 ○ Less than 3.75

39. Minimum grade average for High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.

○ 3.8 or above ○ 3.6 - 3.74 ○ Less than 3.5
○ 3.75 - 3.79 ○ 3.5 - 3.59

40. Minimum grade average for Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

○ 3.75 or above ○ 3.4 - 3.49 ○ Less than 3.0
○ 3.6 - 3.74 ○ 3.25 - 3.39
○ 3.5 - 3.59 ○ 3.0 - 3.24

Based on a percentage of students
(do not answer 41-43 if you answered 38-40)

41. Percentage of students used for calculation of Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

○ 5% or less ○ 6% - 10% ○ 11% - 15% ○ More than 15%

42. Percentage of students used for calculation of High Honors, Magna Cum Laude.

○ 5% or less ○ 11% - 15% ○ More than 20%
○ 6% - 10% ○ 16% - 20%

43. Percentage of students used for calculation of Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

○ 10% or less ○ 20% - 24% ○ More than 30%
○ 10% - 19% ○ 25% - 30%

44. Approximately what percent of your students who received undergraduate degrees in the past year earned graduation honors? (All levels - Highest Honors, High Honors, Honors, etc.)

○ 10% or less ○ 16% - 20% ○ 26% - 30%
○ 11% - 15% ○ 21% - 25% ○ More than 30%

45. Do you include transfer grades when calculating graduation honors?

○ No ○ Yes ○ Yes, but with qualifications

46. Has your institution made any significant changes in its graduation honors criteria during the past five years?

○ No ○ Yes (If yes,)
○ Made criteria more stringent
○ Made criteria more lenient

Thank You! Survey is complete.
Please send survey in enclosed envelope.

APPENDIX B

Frequency of Responses by State or Country

In what state or country is your institution?

STATE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	STATE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
AL	23	1.4	NH	10	0.6
AK	6	0.4	NJ	30	1.9
AZ	16	1.0	NM	11	0.7
AR	16	1.0	NY	111	6.9
CA	81	5.1	NC	40	2.5
CO	25	1.6	ND	12	0.7
CT	25	1.6	OH	59	3.7
DE	3	0.2	OK	21	1.3
FL	38	2.4	OR	19	1.2
GA	37	2.3	PA	84	5.2
HI	7	0.4	RI	5	0.3
ID	8	0.5	SC	23	1.4
IL	67	4.2	SD	12	0.7
IN	39	2.4	TN	35	2.2
IA	32	2.0	TX	89	5.6
KS	27	1.7	UT	9	0.6
KY	22	1.4	VT	10	0.6
LA	20	1.2	VA	33	2.1
ME	14	0.9	WA	24	1.5
MD	31	1.9	WV	19	1.2
MA	58	3.6	WI	40	2.5
MI	47	2.9	WY	6	0.4
MN	32	2.0	CAN	72	4.5
MS	11	0.7	OTHER	24	1.5
MO	43	2.7	SUBTOTAL	1,558	97.3
MT	6	0.4	Multiple Response	4	0.2
NE	20	1.2	No Response	39	2.4
NV	6	0.4	TOTAL	1,601	99.9

Appendix C

Responses to Survey Questions by Type of Institution

Table C.1

Question 2: In what state or country (if not U.S.A.) is your institution located? If not U.S.A. or Canada, indicate "Country other than U.S.A. or Canada."

STATE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		GRADUATE	TYPE INFO MISSING	TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PROFESSIONAL			
AL	6	3	0	4	9	0	1	—	23	1.4
AK	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	—	6	0.4
AZ	9	0	0	2	3	0	1	1	16	1.0
AR	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	—	16	1.0
CA	4	4	0	28	15	18	12	—	81	5.1
CO	6	1	9	2	3	2	2	—	25	1.6
CT	7	2	2	2	4	6	2	—	25	1.6
DE	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	—	3	0.2
FL	14	1	0	10	6	7	0	—	38	2.4
GA	8	2	8	10	4	2	1	—	35	2.3
HI	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	—	7	0.4
ID	3	1	0	1	3	0	0	—	8	0.5
IL	18	2	0	21	9	11	5	1	67	4.2
IN	2	1	1	18	11	6	0	—	39	2.4
IA	7	2	0	15	3	5	0	—	32	2.0
KS	7	2	1	10	5	1	1	—	27	1.7
KY	2	1	1	14	4	0	0	—	22	1.4
LA	3	0	1	3	8	2	1	2	20	1.2
ME	3	0	1	4	5	0	0	1	14	0.9
MD	6	0	2	14	7	1	0	1	31	1.9
MA	7	3	5	31	3	6	1	2	58	3.6
MI	14	3	7	12	7	2	1	1	47	2.9
MN	4	1	2	12	6	2	4	2	33	2.0
MS	0	1	1	2	5	1	1	—	11	0.7

STATE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		GRADUATE	TYPE INFO MISSING	TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PROFESSIONAL			
MO	8	1	5	16	6	2	5	—	43	2.7
MT	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	—	6	0.4
NE	7	0	3	8	1	1	0	—	20	1.2
NV	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	—	6	0.4
NH	0	0	2	6	1	1	0	—	10	0.6
NJ	10	1	8	4	2	4	1	—	30	1.9
NM	5	0	1	3	2	0	0	—	11	0.7
NY	23	7	16	41	6	15	3	—	111	6.9
NC	4	2	1	17	11	5	0	—	40	2.5
ND	5	0	0	3	4	0	0	—	12	0.7
OH	13	0	4	23	9	10	0	—	59	3.7
OK	5	1	3	2	7	2	1	—	21	1.3
OR	1	0	2	10	3	2	0	1	19	1.2
PA	7	5	4	39	9	16	4	—	84	5.2
RI	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	—	5	0.3
SC	3	0	5	9	3	3	0	—	23	1.4
SD	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	—	12	0.7
TN	9	1	1	11	7	3	2	1	35	2.2
TX	33	0	2	10	23	11	6	—	85	5.6
UT	4	1	0	1	2	1	0	—	9	0.6
VT	1	1	0	6	1	0	1	—	10	0.6
VA	6	1	4	11	6	4	1	—	33	2.1
WA	12	0	1	3	3	4	0	—	23	1.5
WV	3	0	6	5	2	1	2	—	19	1.2
WI	8	1	1	18	9	2	1	—	40	2.5
WY	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	—	6	0.4
CANADA	16	0	3	4	35	7	2	—	67	4.5
OTHER	2	0	2	4	3	10	3	—	24	1.5
TOTAL	333	54	122	487	294	179	65	13	1,547	

NO RESPONSE = 39

MULTIPLE RESPONSE = 4

Table C.2

Question 4: Indicate the size of your institution based on Fall 1991 total student enrollment. Use headcount, not F.T.E.—Do not include extension, correspondence, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		GRADUATE	TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PROFESSIONAL		
500	4	19	1	76	1	5	5	111	7.5
500-999	17	24	5	117	4	11	1	179	12.1
1,000-2,499	62	9	21	232	15	53	1	393	26.6
2,500-4,999	92	1	39	44	25	47	0	248	16.8
5,000-9,999	86	1	32	16	77	31	0	243	16.5
10,000-19,999	49	0	20	2	97	22	0	190	12.9
20,000 +	19	0	5	0	77	11	0	112	7.6
TOTAL	329	54	123	487	296	180	7	1,476	
PERCENT	22.3	3.7	8.3	33.0	20.1	12.2	0.5		

No response = 47

Table C.3

Question 5: What type of academic calendar is currently used by your institution?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Early semester *	248	23	97	345	211	106	1,030	70.1
Traditional semester	16	3	4	17	12	12	64	4.4
Term or quarter	60	24	16	34	44	28	206	14.0
Trimester	4	3	2	7	9	8	33	2.2
4-1-4	2	1	2	65	6	21	97	6.6
Other	4	0	1	15	15	5	40	2.7
TOTAL	334	54	122	483	297	180	1,470	
PERCENT	22.7	3.7	8.3	32.9	20.2	12.2		

No response = 94

* Early semester ends before Christmas.

Table C.4

Question 6: Which of the following grading systems best describes your current grading system:
6a: Letter and/or Numeric using the 4.0 system. If yes, does your institution have:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Letter grades only	232	24	64	144	152	52	668	47.8
Letters with (+) (-)	50	18	42	264	90	92	556	40.0
Letters with (+) only	15	6	6	35	13	18	93	6.7
Letters with (-) only	0	0	1	3	2	0	6	0.4
Letter and numbers	13	1	6	14	11	3	48	3.4
Numeric grades	11	0	1	3	1	8	24	1.7
TOTAL	321	49	120	463	269	173	1,395	
PERCENT	23.0	3.5	8.5	33.2	19.3	12.4		

No response = 165

Table C.5

Question 6: Which of the following grading systems best describes your current grading system:
6b: Letter and/or Numeric grades indicating values different from a 4.0 scale. If yes, does your system have:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Letter grades	15	1	1	11	13	7	48	32.4
Numerical grades	5	0	1	0	4	5	15	10.1
Letter grades and percentages	21	4	3	14	9	6	57	38.5
Combination of numeric and letter grades	5	0	2	0	10	1	18	12.2
Narratives only	0	2	1	4	2	1	10	6.8
TOTAL	46	7	8	29	38	20	148	
PERCENT	31.1	4.7	5.4	19.6	25.7	13.5		

No response = 1,437

Table C.6

Question 7: Have you had substantive changes in your grading system in the last five years? If yes:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Added (+) and/or (-)	32	3	14	57	30	28	164	91.6
To letter grades from numeric	1	1	1	2	1	0	6	3.4
To letter grades from narratives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
To numeric grades from letters	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	3.9
To numeric grades from narratives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
To narratives from letter grades	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
To narratives from numeric grades	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.6
To percentages from letter grades	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.6
To percentages from narrative evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
TOTAL	40	4	16	59	32	28	179	
PERCENT	22.3	2.2	8.9	33.0	17.9	15.6		

No response = 1,422

Table C.7

Question 8: Do you anticipate any substantive changes in your grading systems within the next five years?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	9	0	7	17	14	9	56	3.8
If Yes:								
Added (+) and/or (-) *	7	0	6	16	13	8	50	
To letter grades from numeric *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To letter grades from narratives *	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
To numeric grades from letters *	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
To numeric grades from narratives *	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
To narratives from letter grades *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To narratives from numeric grades *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To percentages from letter grades *	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
To percentages from narrative evaluations *	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
No	322	54	116	469	281	171	1,413	96.2
TOTAL	331	54	123	486	295	180	1,469	
PERCENT	22.5	3.7	8.4	33.1	20.1	12.3		

No response = 132

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table C.8

Question 9: Which of the following best describes your policy on failing grades?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Assigned and recorded on the permanent academic record and included in the grade average	319	49	121	473	286	178	1,426	97.1
Assigned and recorded on the permanent academic record but not included in the grade average	5	2	0	5	9	1	22	1.5
Assigned but not recorded on the permanent academic record	1	1	1	4	1	2	10	0.7
Assigned but recorded on the academic record as something other than a symbol that would represent failure	4	0	0	2	0	1	7	0.5
Not assigned but a record of attempt is kept	1	0	1	2	0	0	4	0.2
TOTAL	330	52	123	486	296	182	1,469	
PERCENT	22.5	3.5	8.3	33.1	20.1	12.4		

No response = 104

Table C.9

Question 10: When determining a student's cumulative grade average, does your institution:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Enter all grades including transfer work in the calculation	57	6	29	84	71	27	274	18.8
Use only grades earned at your institution	274	47	91	396	219	155	1,182	81.2
TOTAL	331	53	120	480	290	182	1,456	
PERCENT	22.7	3.6	8.2	33.0	19.9	12.5		

No response = 120

Table C.10

Question 11: Does your institution permit students to opt to take courses using the pass/fail (or similar) grading option?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	100	6	75	285	189	121	776	52.8
No	233	48	47	201	106	60	695	47.2
TOTAL	333	54	122	486	295	181	1,471	
PERCENT	22.6	3.7	8.3	33.0	20.1	12.3		

No response = 130

Table C.11

Question 12: How many courses per term (quarter or semester) can a student take using this option?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
One	20	1	35	163	78	71	368	49.3
Two	10	0	9	35	15	11	80	10.7
Three	2	0	1	4	3	2	12	1.6
Four	2	0	2	6	4	2	16	2.1
No Limit	65	4	25	64	84	29	271	36.3
TOTAL	99	5	72	272	184	115	747	
PERCENT	13.3	0.7	9.6	36.4	24.5	15.4		

No response = 854

Table C.12

Question 13: How many courses during an undergraduate academic career can a student take using this grading option?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
1 to 3	15	0	12	44	14	22	107	14.2
4 to 6	20	1	27	114	67	43	272	36.2
7 to 9	8	0	12	48	22	29	119	15.8
10 +	10	0	6	17	31	3	67	8.9
No limit	45	4	15	53	48	22	187	24.9
PERCENT	13.0	0.7	9.6	36.7	24.2	15.8		

No response = 849

Table C.13

Question 14: Are the courses which can be taken using this grading option limited to elective courses?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	42	5	48	205	135	83	518	67.4
No	58	1	27	76	54	35	251	32.6
TOTAL	100	6	75	281	189	118	769	
PERCENT	13.0	0.8	9.8	36.5	24.5	15.3		

No response = 832

Table C.14

Question 15: If "no" to Question 14, can the courses be taken to satisfy courses within the major?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	42	1	19	44	29	14	149	42.6
No	14	0	12	43	28	25	122	34.9
Not applicable	10	0	12	25	21	11	79	22.5
TOTAL	66	1	43	112	78	50	350	
PERCENT	18.9	0.3	12.3	32.0	22.3	14.3		

No response = 1,251

Table C.15a (letter grading system)

Question 16: What minimum grade represents a "Pass," "Credit," or "Satisfactory" specified in Question 11?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
C	45	3	25	84	67	33	257	33.1
C-	5	0	9	64	19	21	118	15.2
D	20	1	23	61	48	28	181	23.3
D-	8	1	8	46	29	20	112	14.4
Instructor determines	23	1	10	30	27	17	108	13.9
TOTAL	101	6	75	285	190	119	776	
PERCENT	13.0	0.8	9.7	36.7	24.5	15.3		

No response = 825

Table C.15b (numeric grading system)

Question 16: What minimum grade represents a "Pass," "Credit," or "Satisfactory" specified in Question 11?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
75 or above	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5.9
70	1	1	1	3	0	0	6	35.3
65	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5.9
60	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	23.5
50	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	23.5
Below 50	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5.9
TOTAL	2	1	1	4	5	4	17	
PERCENT	11.8	5.9	5.9	23.5	29.4	23.5		

No response = 1,584

Table C.16

Question 17: If a student "fails" (unsatisfactory, no credit, etc.) a course while using the student grading option in #11, do you record the grade of "fail" or other similar symbol to denote a failure, on the student's permanent academic record?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes and include in the grade average	37	4	33	132	76	63	345	44.0
Yes and do not include in the grade average	58	1	40	138	109	57	403	50.2
No and not posted to the academic record	5	2	2	17	6	3	35	5.8
TOTAL	100	7	75	287	191	123	783	
PERCENT	12.7	0.9	9.6	36.6	24.3	15.6		

No response = 818

Table C.17

Question 18: Does your institution permit students to register for courses on an "audit" basis?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	323	40	112	447	277	163	1,362	92.5
No	11	14	11	38	17	20	111	7.5
TOTAL	334	54	123	485	294	183	1,473	
PERCENT	22.7	3.7	8.4	32.9	20.0	12.4		

No response = 128

Table C.18

Question 19: Are the courses that are audited recorded on the transcript?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	295	31	87	411	230	141	1,195	84.5
No	31	18	20	58	59	34	220	15.6
TOTAL	326	49	107	469	289	175	1,415	
PERCENT	22.9	3.4	8.2	32.9	20.3	12.3		

No response = 176

Table C.19

Question 20: Can a student get credit by examination for the audited course?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	114	4	36	82	73	37	346	24.7
No	207	44	79	385	210	130	1,055	75.3
TOTAL	321	48	115	467	283	167	1,401	
PERCENT	22.9	3.4	8.2	33.3	20.2	11.9		

No response = 200

Table C.20

Question 21: Does your institution allow students to receive "Incomplete" grades?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	325	52	118	481	289	176	1,441	98.1
If Yes *								
A **	270	39	94	372	242	151	1,168	
B **	31	10	23	124	35	36	259	
C **	109	21	51	107	113	55	456	
No	5	2	3	7	6	5	28	1.9
TOTAL	330	54	121	488	295	181	1,469	

No response = 132

* If yes: A) At the discretion of the faculty member, B) Awarded for substantiated medical reasons, C) If a majority of the coursework has been completed.

** Multiple responses or no responses were received for A, B, and C so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table C.21

Question 22: Is there a deadline for "Incomplete" grade resolution?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	309	50	112	458	273	171	1,373	97.8
No	7	2	1	7	10	4	31	2.2
TOTAL	316	52	113	465	283	175	1,404	
PERCENT	22.4	3.7	8.1	33.1	20.2	12.5		

No response = 198

Table C.22

Question 22 (continued): If yes to the inquiry above, please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline for incomplete resolution:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	311	50	117	460	275	173	1,386	97.8
If Yes *								
A **	148	12	38	123	96	44	461	
B **	23	0	14	11	45	8	101	
C **	20	0	15	6	47	7	95	
D **	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	
E **	25	2	9	53	12	15	116	
F **	7	16	2	42	5	11	83	
G **	25	5	7	45	12	25	119	
H **	19	6	8	48	9	17	107	
I **	9	0	5	14	11	6	45	
J **	2	1	5	4	4	7	23	
K **	4	0	2	3	7	5	21	
L **	3	0	3	0	2	1	9	
M **	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
N **	0	1	0	5	1	4	11	
O **	8	3	0	40	5	7	63	
P **	2	4	2	29	2	5	44	
Q **	3	0	2	6	5	2	18	
R **	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
S **	0	0	1	6	0	1	8	
T **	2	0	0	2	0	2	6	
U **	9	0	2	20	12	6	49	
No	7	2	1	7	10	4	31	2.2
TOTAL	318	52	118	467	285	177	1,417	

No response = 198

* Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items listed under "If Yes" in this table.

** Multiple responses or no responses were received for A-U so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table C.23

Question 23: If the "Incomplete" grade is not resolved by the deadline, or there is no deadline, what is the permanent grade of record?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Failure (or whatever symbol denotes failure)	231	42	96	382	212	130	1,093	76.4
Remains an incomplete	49	6	11	32	42	20	160	11.2
No record/ no credit, etc.	3	2	1	9	1	2	18	1.3
Course withdrawal	9	0	1	6	2	1	19	1.3
Other	31	1	6	49	31	22	140	9.8
TOTAL	323	51	115	478	288	175	1,430	
PERCENT	22.6	3.6	8.0	33.4	20.1	12.2		

No response = 171

Table C.24

Question 24: Under ordinary circumstances, what is the last date in a term (semester or quarter) that a student can discontinue a course without having it recorded on the permanent academic record? Please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
A	77	17	38	162	66	48	408	28.0
B	115	8	39	133	91	65	451	31.0
C	38	5	18	37	35	12	145	10.0
D	23	2	3	39	30	11	108	7.4
E	3	1	2	10	9	0	25	1.7
F	3	3	1	13	15	7	42	2.9
G	2	3	1	14	1	6	27	1.9
H	5	2	1	13	9	7	37	2.5
I	21	0	8	24	14	5	72	4.9
J	16	2	6	20	20	7	71	4.9
K	22	9	4	13	3	5	56	3.8
L	4	1	0	8	2	0	15	1.0
TOTAL	329	53	121	486	295	173	1,457	
PERCENT	22.6	3.6	8.3	33.4	20.2	11.9		

No response = 144

Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items used in this table.

Table C.25

Question 25: What is the time limit beyond which you will ordinarily not allow a grade change (excluding removal of incomplete grades)? Please indicate the response which best approximates your policy.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
A	32	9	23	84	47	19	214	15.0
B	50	1	12	46	28	13	150	10.5
C	104	14	36	125	106	60	445	31.3
D	20	5	10	50	17	16	118	8.3
E	15	6	3	24	12	6	66	4.6
F	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	0.4
G	2	0	1	7	2	3	15	1.1
H	5	9	1	17	2	7	41	2.9
I	7	0	3	20	8	5	43	3.0
J	3	2	3	8	5	8	29	2.0
K	1	0	2	8	2	2	15	1.1
L	3	0	1	13	4	2	23	1.6
M	35	2	12	41	23	16	129	9.1
N	20	1	5	18	12	8	64	4.5
O	21	0	6	10	20	8	65	4.6
TOTAL	318	49	118	473	288	176	1,422	
PERCENT	22.4	3.4	8.3	33.3	20.3	12.4		

No response = 179

Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items listed in this table.

Table C.26

Question 26: Are students permitted to repeat courses they have already taken at your institution to better their grades?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	319	49	111	429	279	170	1,357	94.8
If Yes:								
Can only repeat failures *	9	10	8	38	13	19	97	
Cannot be a course required for the major *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Can only be a course required for the major *	0	1	0	4	0	2	7	
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "C" or lower *	20	3	7	23	19	7	79	
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "D" or lower *	69	9	32	131	81	44	366	
Can repeat any course for a better grade *	221	26	64	233	166	98	808	
No	4	4	6	44	8	9	75	5.2
TOTAL	323	53	117	473	287	179	1,432	

No response = 166

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table C.27

Question 27: In calculating grade averages, how do you accommodate repeated course grades?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Both are calculated in the averaging of grades	40	7	25	77	79	50	278	19.9
Only the most recent grade is included in averaging	161	25	59	202	132	70	649	46.5
Only the highest grade is used in the averaging	100	19	21	143	41	38	362	26.0
Other	14	0	11	27	36	18	106	7.6
TOTAL	315	51	116	449	288	176	1,395	
PERCENT	22.6	3.7	8.3	32.2	20.7	12.6		

No response = 196

Table C.28

Question 28: Do you allow additional graduation credit for a course repeated to better the grade?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
No	297	45	106	409	264	167	1,288	

No response = 313

Table C.29

Question 29: How many times can a single course be repeated?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Once	38	13	17	75	60	22	225	16.2
Twice	39	6	7	40	21	17	130	9.4
Three times	25	2	6	24	15	13	85	6.1
Unlimited	220	27	86	306	194	115	948	68.3
TOTAL	322	48	116	445	290	167	1,388	
PERCENT	23.9	3.5	8.4	32.1	20.9	12.0		

No response = 218

Table C.30

Question 30: Has your institution made any changes in its repeated course policies during the past five years?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	274	47	87	377	222	150	1,157	

No response = 444

Table C.31

Question 31: If your institution has several undergraduate schools (arts and sciences, engineering, business, nursing, etc.), are there different grading systems and grades for different schools?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	7	2	4	4	13	10	40	2.7
No	92	13	73	102	261	129	670	45.9
Not applicable							750	51.4
TOTAL	99	15	77	106	274	139	1,460	

No response = 141

Table C.32

Question 32: If your institution has several different undergraduate schools (see Question 31), are there different deadlines and time limits established for the school with respect to submission of grades, grade changes, make-up of incompletes, etc.?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	3	1	0	7	15	6	32	2.3
No	88	11	77	97	256	128	657	46.5
Not applicable							723	51.2
TOTAL	91	12	77	104	271	134	1,412	

No response = 189

Table C.33

Question 33: Who determines grade policy at your institution?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Academic administration including vp's and deans	122	39	26	100	63	55	405	28.6
University-wide faculty governance group	32	3	45	114	126	72	392	27.7
School-wide faculty governance group	36	7	15	149	12	15	234	16.5
University-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students	52	2	20	49	84	29	236	16.7
School-wide group of administrators, faculty, and students	70	3	9	58	4	5	149	10.5
TOTAL	312	54	115	470	289	176	1,416	
PERCENT	22.0	3.8	8.1	33.2	20.4	12.4		

No response = 185

Table C.34

Question 34: Does your institution have an academic bankruptcy or forgiveness policy?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	123	12	41	77	121	28	402	27.7
No	167	35	67	374	143	136	922	63.6
No, but considering one	40	4	14	31	26	11	126	8.7
TOTAL	330	51	122	482	290	175	1,450	
PERCENT	22.8	3.5	8.4	33.2	20.0	12.1		

No response = 151

Table C.35

Question 35: Academic bankruptcy or forgiveness can apply if a student (mark all that apply):

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	
Has obtained a certain age	0	1	0	3	3	2	9
Has not attended any other school for a set period of time	25	1	14	8	41	5	94
Has not attended this school for a set period of time	55	11	31	43	63	15	218
Has maintained good standing at this school after reenrollment	37	8	8	14	28	1	96
Other	45	2	11	31	40	10	139
TOTAL	162	23	64	99	175	33	556

No response = 1,459

Table C.36

Question 36: The bankruptcy or forgiveness policy is implemented by:

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Giving a new start by removing all courses from a specific time period from the previous record	19	3	4	13	18	1	58	14.1
Removing only courses below "C" from the previous record	5	0	3	9	6	3	26	6.3
Removing only failing courses from the previous record	5	0	1	1	1	3	11	2.7
Keeping all courses from the previous record, but not counting them in the cumulative totals	52	4	18	24	54	10	162	39.3
Keeping all courses from the previous record and only counting those courses which were above passing in cumulative totals	13	3	8	13	20	3	60	14.6
Other	33	3	8	17	23	11	95	23.1
TOTAL	127	13	42	77	122	31	412	
PERCENT	30.1	3.2	10.2	18.7	30.3	7.5		

No response = 1,189

Table C.37

Question 37: Does your institution calculate and award graduation honors ("Highest Honors," "Summa Cum Laude," etc.)?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	251	36	114	450	276	166	1,293	88.7
No	76	17	7	36	15	13	164	11.3
TOTAL	327	53	121	486	291	179	1,457	
PERCENT	22.4	3.6	8.3	33.4	20.0	12.3		

No response = 144

Honors Based on Cumulative Grade Point Averages

Table C.38

Question 38: Minimum grade average for Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
3.90 or above	93	16	44	216	108	71	548	49.9
3.80-3.89	44	6	24	139	66	55	334	30.4
3.75-3.79	36	3	26	41	29	9	144	13.1
3.74 or below	15	1	8	16	20	12	72	6.6
TOTAL	188	26	102	412	223	147	1,098	
PERCENT	17.1	2.4	9.3	37.5	20.3	13.4		

No response = 503

Table C.39

Question 39: Minimum grade average for High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
3.80 or above	31	5	7	34	25	13	115	10.7
3.75-3.79	53	5	29	125	49	32	293	27.3
3.60-3.74	39	7	32	171	73	72	394	36.7
3.50-3.59	65	12	32	61	45	21	236	22.0
3.49 or below	8	0	5	8	11	5	37	3.4
TOTAL	196	29	105	399	203	143	1,075	
PERCENT	18.2	2.7	9.8	37.1	18.9	13.3		

No response = 526

Table C.40

Question 40: Minimum grade average for Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
3.75 or above	13	3	0	9	10	6	41	3.6
3.60-3.74	5	2	9	30	19	12	77	6.8
3.50-3.59	108	15	45	194	96	62	520	45.7
3.40-3.49	7	1	11	76	33	28	156	13.7
3.25-3.39	49	5	28	85	35	26	228	20.0
3.00-3.24	39	7	12	21	23	10	112	9.0
2.99 or below	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	0.4
TOTAL	221	33	105	417	218	145	1,139	
PERCENT	19.4	2.9	9.2	36.6	19.1	12.7		

No response = 462

Honors Based on a Percentage of Students

Table C.41

Question 41: Percentage of students used for calculation of Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
5% or less	23	5	15	45	51	22	161	83.0
6%-10%	8	1	3	3	8	0	23	11.9
11%-15%	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	1.5
16% or more	1	1	1	1	2	1	7	3.6
TOTAL	34	7	19	50	61	23	194	
PERCENT	17.5	3.6	9.8	25.8	31.4	11.9		

No response = 1,407

Table C.42

Question 42: Percentage of students used for calculation of High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
5% or less	14	4	5	19	26	12	80	40.6
6%-10%	14	1	8	26	23	7	79	40.1
11%-15%	6	1	3	4	3	4	21	10.7
16%-20%	2	1	1	2	2	0	8	4.1
20% or more	2	1	1	0	4	1	9	4.6
TOTAL	38	8	18	51	58	24	197	
PERCENT	19.3	4.1	9.1	25.9	29.4	12.2		

No response = 1,404

Table C.43

Question 43: Percentage of students used for calculation of Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
10% or less	17	4	5	26	34	10	96	44.2
10%-19%	12	3	10	18	23	11	77	35.5
20%-24%	8	0	2	7	4	4	25	11.5
25%-30%	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	1.4
31% or more	4	1	3	4	2	2	16	7.4
TOTAL	41	8	21	56	64	27	217	
PERCENT	18.9	4.1	9.7	25.8	29.5	12.4		

No response = 1,384

Table C.44

Question 44: Approximately what percent of your students who received undergraduate degrees in the past year earned graduation honors? (All levels—Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.)

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
10% or less	62	8	30	79	96	30	305	27.0
11%-15%	56	6	24	77	49	38	250	22.1
16%-20%	27	10	22	68	36	30	193	17.1
21%-25%	17	1	12	73	24	20	147	13.0
26%-30%	18	4	9	45	12	15	103	9.1
31% or more	25	5	8	62	18	15	133	11.8
TOTAL	205	34	105	404	235	148	1,131	
PERCENT	18.1	3.0	9.3	35.7	20.8	13.1		

No response = 470

Table C.45

Question 45: Do you include transfer grades when calculating graduation honors?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	32	3	19	75	53	27	209	16.2
No	214	35	94	372	223	141	1,079	83.8
TOTAL	246	38	113	447	276	168	1,288	
PERCENT	19.1	3.0	8.8	34.7	21.4	13.0		

No response = 313

Table C.46

Question 46: Has your institution made any significant changes in its graduation honors criteria during the past five years?

RESPONSE	TWO-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE		FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY		TOTAL	PERCENT
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE		
Yes	32	3	19	75	53	27	209	16.2
If Yes:								
Made criteria more stringent *	26	3	17	56	40	20	162	
Made criteria more lenient *	3	0	3	17	7	5	35	
No	214	35	94	372	223	141	1,079	83.8
TOTAL	246	38	113	447	276	168	1,288	
PERCENT	19.1	3.0	8.8	34.7	21.4	13.0		

No response = 313

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Appendix D

Responses to Survey Questions by Size of Institution

Table D.1

Question 2: In what state (or country, if not U.S.A.) is your institution located? (If not U.S.A. or Canada, indicate country other than U.S.A. or Canada.):

STATE	2,499 OR LESS	2,500-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000 +	SIZE INFO MISSING	TOTAL	PERCENT
AL	9	8	3	2	1	23	1.4
AK	3	2	1	0	—	6	0.4
AZ	3	5	3	4	1	16	1.0
AR	7	8	1	0	—	16	1.0
CA	38	18	8	8	9	81	5.1
CO	3	4	4	2	2	15	0.8
CT	10	11	1	1	2	25	1.6
DE	2	0	0	1	—	3	0.2
FL	13	10	9	5	1	38	2.4
GA	16	16	3	2	—	37	2.3
HI	5	1	1	0	—	7	0.4
ID	2	3	3	0	—	8	0.5
IL	23	18	14	6	6	67	4.2
IN	20	11	3	5	—	39	2.4
IA	27	2	1	2	—	32	2.0
KS	15	7	1	2	2	27	1.7
KY	16	2	3	1	—	22	1.4
LA	3	9	5	1	2	20	1.2
ME	11	1	2	0	—	14	0.9
MD	14	8	6	2	1	31	1.9
MA	33	21	2	2	—	58	3.6
MI	14	18	9	5	1	47	2.9
MN	17	9	2	1	3	32	2.0
MS	3	4	3	0	1	11	0.7
MO	20	13	4	1	5	43	2.7

STATE	2,499 OR LESS	2,500-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000 +	SIZE INFO MISSING	TOTAL	PERCENT
MT	4	1	1	0	—	6	0.4
NE	13	5	1	1	—	20	1.2
NV	0	3	3	0	—	6	0.4
NH	6	3	1	0	—	10	0.6
NJ	7	14	7	1	1	30	1.9
NM	10	1	0	0	—	11	0.7
NY	46	45	15	2	3	111	6.9
NC	21	12	5	2	—	40	2.5
ND	9	2	1	0	—	12	0.7
OH	32	15	7	5	—	59	3.7
OK	8	9	1	2	1	21	1.3
OR	12	3	3	1	—	19	1.2
PA	48	21	4	6	5	84	5.2
RI	1	2	2	0	—	5	0.3
SC	13	8	1	1	—	23	1.4
SD	9	3	0	0	—	12	0.7
TN	17	12	3	1	2	35	2.2
TX	25	39	7	11	7	89	5.6
UT	3	2	3	1	—	9	0.6
VT	8	0	1	0	1	10	0.6
VA	17	9	3	3	1	33	2.1
WA	7	12	2	1	2	24	1.5
WV	9	7	1	0	2	19	1.2
WI	20	12	3	3	2	40	2.5
WY	2	2	1	0	1	6	0.4
CAN	8	25	18	18	3	72	4.5
OTHER	10	9	1	1	3	24	1.5
TOTAL	692	485	187	113	71	1,548	

No response = 39
Multiple response = 4

Table D.2

Question 3: Is your institution a:

- ☐ Two Year Public Community or Junior College
- ☐ Two Year Private Community or Junior College
- ☐ Four Year Public College
- ☐ Four Year Private College
- ☐ Four Year Public University
- ☐ Four Year Private University
- ☐ Graduate or Professional only (no undergraduates)
- ☐ If the above response was answered, no additional information was requested.

Please see Appendix C, Table C.2 for the cross-tabulation of respondent's institutional size by type of institution.

Table D.3

Question 5: What type of academic calendar is currently used by your institution?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Early semester *	470	68.3	350	70.9	133	70.0	82	71.9	1,035	69.7
Traditional semester	26	3.8	35	7.1	2	1.1	4	3.5	67	4.5
Term or quarter	90	13.1	68	13.8	33	17.4	16	14.0	207	13.9
Trimester	14	2.0	9	1.8	9	4.7	7	6.1	39	2.6
4-1-4	69	10.0	24	4.9	4	2.1	1	0.9	98	6.6
Other	19	2.8	8	1.6	9	4.7	4	3.5	40	2.7
TOTAL	688		494		190		114		1,486	

No response = 94
* Early semester ends before Christmas.

Table D.4

Question 6:Which of the following grading systems best describes your current grading system:
6a: Letter and/or Numeric using the 4.0 system. If yes, does your institution have:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Letter grades only	266	40.7	260	54.9	94	53.7	51	49.5	671	47.7
Letter grades with (+) and (-)	311	47.6	152	32.1	62	35.4	38	36.7	563	40.0
Letter grades with (+) only	45	6.9	35	7.4	8	4.6	7	6.8	95	6.8
Letter grades with (-) only	3	0.5	1	0.2	1	0.6	1	1.0	6	0.4
Numeric grades only	10	1.5	11	2.3	2	1.1	1	1.0	24	1.7
Both letter and numeric grades	19	2.9	15	3.2	8	4.6	5	4.9	47	3.3
TOTAL	654		474		175		103		1,406	

No response = 165

Table D.5

Question 6: Which of the following grading systems best describes your current grading system:
6b: Letter and/or Numeric grades indicating values different from a 4.0 scale. If yes, does your system have:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Letter grades only	20	29.9	14	28.6	8	32.0	9	50.0	51	32.0
Numerical grades only	3	4.5	8	16.3	4	16.0	1	5.6	16	10.01
Letter grades and percentage	35	52.2	17	34.7	7	28	3	16.7	62	39.0
Combination of numerics and letters	1	1.5	8	16.3	5	20.0	5	27.8	19	12.0
Narrative evaluations only	8	11.9	2	4.1	1	4.0	0	0.0	11	6.9
TOTAL	67		49		25		18		159	

No response = 1,437

Table D.6

Question 7: Have you had substantive changes in your grading system in the last five years? If yes:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Added (+) and/or (-)	72	96.0	60	85.7	27	93.0	7	87.5	166	91.2
To letter grades from numeric	3	4.0	3	4.3	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	3.8
To letter grades from narratives	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
To numeric grades from letters	0	0.0	5	7.1	2	6.9	0	0.0	7	3.8
To numeric grades from narratives	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
To narratives from letter grades	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
To narratives from numeric grades	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6
To percentages from letter grades	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6
To percentages from narrative evaluations	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	75		70		29		8		182	

No response = 1,419

Table D.7

Question 8: Do you anticipate any substantive changes in your grading system within the next five years?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	22	3.2	17	3.4	10	5.3	6	5.3	55	3.7
If Yes:										
Added (+) and/or (-) *	20		15		9		5		49	
To letter grades from numeric *	0		0		0		0		0	
To letter grades from narratives *	1		0		0		0		1	
To numeric grades from letters *	1		1		0		0		2	
To numeric grades from narratives *	0		0		0		1		1	
To narratives from letter grades *	0		0		0		0		0	
To narratives from numeric grades *	0		0		0		0		0	
To percentages from letter grades *	0		0		1		0		1	
To percentages from narrative evaluations *	1		0		0		1		2	
No	665	96.8	477	96.6	180	94.7	107	94.7	1,429	96.3
TOTAL	687		494		190		113		1,484	

No response = 117

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table D.8

Question 9: Which of the following best describes your policy on failing grades?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Assigned and recorded on the permanent record and included in the grade average	668	97.1	477	96.6	183	96.9	110	97.3	1,438	97.0
Assigned and recorded on the permanent record but not included in the grade average	9	1.3	8	1.6	5	2.6	2	1.8	24	1.6
Assigned but not recorded on the permanent record	7	1.0	2	0.4	1	0.5	0	0.0	10	0.7
Assigned but recorded on the record as something other than a symbol that would represent failure	2	0.3	4	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	7	0.5
Not assigned but a record of attempt is kept	2	0.3	3	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.3
TOTAL	688		494		189		113		1,484	

No response = 104

Table D.9

Question 10: When determining a student's cumulative grade average, does your institution:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Enter all grades including transfer work in the calculation	126	18.5	97	19.8	39	20.9	12	10.8	274	18.7
Use only grades earned at your institution	554	81.5	393	80.2	148	79.1	99	89.2	1,194	81.3
TOTAL	680		490		187		111		1,468	

No response = 120

Table D.10

Question 11: Does your institution permit students to opt to take courses using the pass/fail (or similar) grading option?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	340	49.6	248	49.9	109	57.4	80	70.8	777	52.3
No	346	50.4	249	50.1	81	42.6	33	29.2	709	47.7
TOTAL	686		497		190		113		1,486	

No response = 115

Table D.11

Question 12: How many courses per term (semester or quarter) can a student take using this option?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
One	180	55.2	114	47.1	46	44.2	27	35.1	367	49.0
Two	34	10.4	29	12.0	10	9.6	7	9.1	80	10.7
Three	7	2.1	2	0.8	3	2.9	0	0.0	12	1.6
Four	6	1.8	6	2.5	2	1.9	2	2.6	16	2.1
No Limit	99	30.4	91	37.6	43	41.3	41	53.2	274	36.6
TOTAL	326		242		104		77		749	

No response = 852

Table D.12

Question 13: How many courses during an undergraduate academic career can a student take using this student grading option?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
1 to 3	52	15.9	36	14.9	13	12.0	6	7.8	107	14.2
4 to 6	130	39.6	80	33.2	45	41.7	20	26.0	275	36.5
7 to 9	50	15.2	38	15.8	16	14.8	14	18.2	118	15.6
10 +	15	4.6	22	9.1	18	16.7	11	14.3	66	8.8
No limit	81	24.7	65	27.0	16	14.8	26	33.8	188	24.9
TOTAL	328		241		108		77		754	

No response = 847

Table D.13

Question 14: Are the courses which can be taken using this grading option limited to elective courses?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	237	70.0	160	65.0	72	66.7	53	65.4	522	67.4
No	102	30.0	86	35.0	36	33.3	28	34.6	252	32.6
TOTAL	339		246		108		81		774	

No response = 827

Table D.14

Question 15: If "no" to Question 14, can the courses be taken to satisfy courses within the major?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	60	42.3	50	42.0	18	34.6	22	59.5	150	42.9
No	54	38.0	37	31.1	20	38.5	10	27.0	121	34.6
Not applicable	28	19.7	32	26.9	14	26.9	5	13.5	79	22.6
TOTAL	142		119		52		37		350	

No response = 1,251

Table D.15a (letter grading system)

Question 16: What minimum grade represents "Pass," "Credit," or "Satisfactory" specified in Question 11?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
C	107	31.6	84	33.6	44	40.0	24	30.0	259	33.2
C-	68	20.1	25	10.0	13	11.8	10	12.5	116	14.9
D	64	18.9	66	26.4	29	26.4	21	26.3	180	23.1
D-	52	15.3	35	14.0	12	10.9	12	16.3	111	14.4
Instructor determines	48	14.2	40	16.0	12	10.9	12	15.0	112	14.4
TOTAL	339		250		110		79		778	

No response = 822

Table D.15b (numeric grading system)

Question 16: What minimum grade represents a "Pass," "Credit," or "Satisfactory" specified in Question 11?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
75 or above	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	11.1
70	4	57.1	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	33.3
65	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6
60	2	28.6	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	22.2
50	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	3	100.0	4	22.2
Below 50	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6
TOTAL	7		6		2		3		18	

No response = 1,583

Table D.16

Question 17: If a student "fails" (unsatisfactory, no credit, etc.) a course while using the student grading option in Question 11, do you record the grade of "fail" or other similar symbol to denote a failure on the student's permanent academic record?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes and include in grade average	160	46.8	111	43.9	48	43.7	28	34.6	347	44.1
Yes and do not include in grade average	162	47.4	131	51.8	59	53.6	52	64.2	404	51.4
No not posted to academic record	20	5.8	11	4.3	3	2.7	1	1.2	35	4.5
TOTAL	342		253		110		81		786	

No response = 815

Table D.17

Question 18: Does your institution permit students to register for courses on an "audit" basis?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	627	91.1	465	93.8	179	94.2	102	90.3	1,373	85.8
No	61	8.9	31	6.2	11	5.8	11	9.7	114	14.2
TOTAL	688		496		190		113		1,487	

No response = 114

Table D.18

Question 19: Are the courses that are audited recorded on the transcript?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	566	85.0	411	85.4	157	84.0	79	73.8	1,213	84.2
No	100	15.0	70	14.6	30	16.0	28	26.2	228	15.8
TOTAL	666		481		187		107		1,441	

No response = 160

Table D.19

Question 20: Can a student get credit by examination for the audited course?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	133	20.3	115	24.3	60	33.7	41	37.6	349	24.6
No	523	79.7	359	75.7	118	66.3	68	62.4	1,068	75.4
TOTAL	656		474		178		109		1,417	

No response = 184

Table D.20

Question 21: Does your institution allow students to receive "Incomplete" grades?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	677	98.3	480	97.8	188	98.9	109	95.6	1,454	98.0
If Yes *										
A **	527	79.3	390	81.3	162	86.2	91	83.5	1,180	
B **	164	24.2	60	12.5	22	11.7	15	13.8	261	
C **	178	26.3	161	33.5	77	41.0	41	37.6	457	
No	12	1.7	11	2.2	2	1.1	5	4.4	30	2.0
TOTAL	689		491		190		114		1,484	

No response = 117

* If Yes: A) At the discretion of the faculty member, B) Awarded for substantiated medical reasons, C) If a majority of the coursework has been completed.

** Multiple responses or no responses were received to A, B, and C so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table D.21

Question 22: Is there a deadline for "Incomplete" grade resolution?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	650	98.3	459	97.7	173	96.1	102	97.1	1,384	97.7
No	11	1.7	11	2.3	7	3.9	3	2.9	32	2.3
TOTAL	661		470		180		105		1,416	

No response = 185

Table D.22

Question 22 (continued): If yes to inquiry above, please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline for incomplete resolution:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	650	99.7	459	98.3	173	97.2	102	98.1	1,384	98.8
If Yes *										
A **	193	29.6	173	37.0	65	36.5	34	32.7	465	33.2
B **	25	3.8	39	8.4	15	8.4	21	20.2	100	7.1
C **	16	2.5	37	7.9	21	11.8	22	21.1	96	6.9
D **	2	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
E **	71	10.8	34	7.3	11	6.2	1	1.0	117	8.4
F **	62	9.5	19	4.1	3	1.7	3	2.9	87	6.2
G **	61	9.4	40	8.6	16	9.0	5	4.8	122	8.7
H **	65	10.0	31	6.6	7	3.9	4	3.8	107	7.6
I **	18	2.8	15	3.2	7	3.9	5	4.8	45	3.2
J **	7	1.1	7	1.5	8	4.5	1	1.0	23	1.6
K **	6	0.9	10	2.1	5	2.8	0	0.0	21	1.5
L **	1	0.2	9	1.9	1	0.6	0	0.0	11	0.8
M **	2	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
N **	5	0.8	5	1.1	1	0.6	1	1.0	12	0.9
O **	47	7.2	10	2.1	5	2.8	1	1.0	63	4.5
P **	29	4.4	12	2.6	2	1.1	1	1.0	44	3.1
Q **	6	0.9	6	1.3	4	2.2	1	1.0	17	1.2
R **	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
S **	7	1.1	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	0.6
T **	3	0.5	1	0.2	1	0.6	1	1.0	6	0.4
U **	25	3.8	17	3.6	6	3.4	3	2.9	51	3.6
No	2	0.3	8	1.7	5	2.8	2	1.9	17	1.2
TOTAL	652		467		178		104		1,401	

No response = 200

* Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items listed under "If Yes" in this table.

** Multiple responses or no responses were received to A-U so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table D.23

Question 23: If the "Incomplete" grade is not resolved by the deadline, or there is no deadline, what is the permanent grade of record?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Failure (or whatever symbol denotes failure)	532	78.9	367	77.1	133	70.7	73	68.8	1,105	76.5
Remains an incomplete	59	8.8	62	13.0	27	14.4	14	13.2	162	11.2
No record/ no credit, etc.	11	1.6	5	1.1	1	0.5	1	0.9	18	1.2
Course withdrawal	8	1.2	7	1.5	2	1.1	2	1.9	19	1.3
Other	64	9.5	35	7.4	25	13.3	16	15.1	140	9.7
TOTAL	674		476		188		106		1,444	

No response = 157

Table D.24

Question 24: Under ordinary circumstances, what is the last date in a term (semester or quarter) that a student can discontinue a course without having it recorded on the permanent academic record? Please indicate the response which comes closest to your deadline.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
A	205	30.0	132	26.9	53	27.9	18	16.1	408	27.6
B	202	29.5	167	34.0	48	25.3	37	33.0	454	30.7
C	62	9.1	41	8.4	28	14.7	16	14.3	147	10.0
D	44	6.4	31	6.3	19	10.0	13	11.6	107	7.2
E	14	2.0	6	1.2	7	3.7	8	7.1	35	2.4
F	22	3.2	13	2.6	5	2.6	5	4.5	45	3.0
G	20	2.9	4	0.8	2	1.1	1	0.9	27	1.8
H	13	1.9	17	3.5	6	3.2	1	0.9	37	2.5
I	29	4.2	32	6.5	9	4.7	2	1.8	72	4.9
J	32	4.7	26	5.3	8	4.2	6	5.4	72	4.9
K	32	4.7	18	3.7	5	2.6	3	2.7	58	3.9
L	9	1.3	4	0.8	0	0.0	2	1.8	15	1.0
TOTAL	684		491		190		112		1,477	

No response = 124

Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items listed in this table.

Table D.25

Question 25: What is the time limit beyond which you will ordinarily not allow a grade change (excluding the removal of incomplete grades)? Please indicate the response which best approximates your policy.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
A	107	16.3	65	13.8	27	14.4	17	15.7	216	15.5
B	67	10.2	57	12.1	17	9.1	11	10.2	152	10.9
C	192	29.3	147	31.3	65	34.8	45	41.7	449	32.1
D	71	10.8	23	4.9	11	5.9	7	6.5	112	8.0
E	40	6.1	19	4.0	1	0.5	5	4.6	65	4.7
F	4	0.6	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.4
G	10	1.5	5	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.9	16	1.1
H	26	4.0	10	2.1	4	2.1	3	2.8	43	3.1
I	20	3.1	13	2.8	7	3.7	2	1.9	42	3.0
J	14	2.1	8	1.7	6	3.2	1	0.9	29	2.1
K	5	0.8	6	1.3	3	1.6	3	2.8	17	1.2
L	1	0.2	9	1.9	3	1.6	1	0.9	14	1.0
M	57	8.7	49	10.4	18	9.6	6	5.6	130	9.3
N	26	4.0	25	5.3	11	5.9	3	2.8	65	4.7
O	15	2.3	33	7.0	14	7.5	3	2.8	65	4.7
TOTAL	655		470		187		108		1,420	

No response = 204
Please see Appendix A for key to alphabetic items listed in this table.

Table D.26

Question 26: Are students permitted to repeat courses they have already taken at your institution to better their grades?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	620	92.3	465	97.1	181	97.3	106	95.5	1,372	94.8
If Yes:										
Can only repeat failures *	62	10.0	14	3.0	13	7.2	9	8.6	98	
Cannot be a course required for the major *	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	
Can only be a course required for the major *	5	0.8	1	0.2	2	1.1	0	0.0	8	
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "C" or lower *	35	5.6	32	6.9	8	4.4	5	4.8	80	
Can only be a course where the first attempt was "D" or lower *	166	26.8	130	28.0	44	24.3	30	28.6	370	
Can repeat any course for a better grade *	352	56.8	288	61.9	114	63.0	61	58.0	815	
No	52	7.7	14	2.9	5	2.7	5	4.5	76	5.2
TOTAL	672		479		186		111		1,448	

No response = 153

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Table D.27

Question 27: In calculating grade averages, how do you accommodate repeated course grades?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Both are calculated in the averaging of grades	97	15.1	98	20.3	43	23.0	40	37.3	278	19.6
Only the most recent grade is included in averaging	302	46.9	239	49.6	79	42.2	41	38.3	661	46.5
Only the highest grade is used in the averaging	207	32.1	116	24.1	41	22.0	12	11.2	376	26.5
Other	38	5.9	29	6.0	24	12.8	14	13.2	105	7.4
TOTAL	644		482		187		107		1,420	

No response = 181

Table D.28

Question 28: Do you allow additional graduation credit for a course repeated to better the grade?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No	583	100.0	448	100.0	172	100.0	100	100.0	1,303	

No response = 298

Table D.29

Question 29: How many times can a single course be repeated?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Once	111	17.7	64	13.4	26	14.1	28	25.7	229	16.4
Twice	57	9.1	43	9.0	20	10.9	11	10.1	131	9.4
Three times	29	4.6	34	7.1	12	6.5	8	7.3	83	5.9
Unlimited	430	68.6	337	70.5	126	68.5	62	56.9	955	68.3
TOTAL	627		478		184		109		1,398	

No response = 203

Table D.30

Question 30: Has your institution made any changes in its repeated course policies during the past five years?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No	543	100.0	400	100.0	135	100.0	92	100.0	1,170	

No response = 431

Table D.31

Question 31: If your institution has several undergraduate schools (arts and sciences, engineering, business, nursing, etc.), are there different grading systems and grades for different schools?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	11	6.7	9	2.9	11	7.9	8	7.9	39	2.7
No	153	93.3	297	97.1	129	92.1	94	92.1	673	46.0
Not applicable									750	51.3
TOTAL	164		306		140		102		1,462	

No response = 139

Table D.32

Question 32: If you institution has several different undergraduate schools (see above), are there different deadlines and time limits established for the school with respect to submission of grades, grade changes, make-up of incompletes, etc.?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	9	5.7	9	3.1	7	5.1	7	6.9	32	2.2
No	150	94.3	283	96.9	131	94.9	95	93.1	659	46.3
Not applicable									735	51.6
TOTAL	159		292		138		102		1,426	

No response = 175

Table D.33

Question 33: Who determines grade policy at your institution?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Academic administration (including vp's and deans)	187	27.9	141	30.0	53	29.0	27	24.8	408	28.5
University-wide faculty governance group	160	23.9	126	26.9	64	35.0	50	45.9	400	28.0
Schoolwide faculty governance group	181	27.0	45	9.6	8	4.3	4	3.6	238	16.6
University-wide group of administrators faculty and students	71	10.6	98	20.9	47	25.7	23	21.1	239	16.7
School-wide group of administrators faculty and students	71	10.6	59	12.6	11	6.0	5	4.6	146	10.2
TOTAL	670		469		183		109		1,431	

No response = 170

Table D.34

Question 34: Does your institution have an academic bankruptcy or forgiveness policy?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	125	18.4	156	32.1	77	40.5	43	39.4	401	27.4
No	499	73.6	277	57.1	99	52.1	60	55.0	935	64.0
No but considering one	54	8.0	52	10.8	14	7.4	6	5.6	126	8.6
TOTAL	678		485		190		109		1,462	

No response = 139

Table D.35

Question 35: Academic bankruptcy or forgiveness can apply if a student (mark all that apply):

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Has obtained a certain age	5	3.0	1	0.5	1	1.0	2	3.1	9
Has not attended any other institution for a set period of time	18	10.5	48	22.0	20	19.0	8	12.7	94
Has not attended this institution for a set period of time	76	44.4	78	35.7	41	39.0	23	36.5	218
Has maintained good standing at this institution after reenrollment	28	16.4	41	18.8	14	13.3	13	20.7	96
Other	44	25.7	50	23.0	29	27.7	17	27.0	140
TOTAL	171		218		105		63		557

Table D.36

Question 36: The bankruptcy or forgiveness policy is implemented by:

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Giving a new start by removing all courses from a specific time period from the previous record	21	16.1	26	16.0	6	8.0	5	11.7	58	14.1
Removing only courses below "C" from the previous record	12	9.2	10	6.1	3	4.0	1	2.3	26	6.3
Removing only failing courses from the previous record	4	3.0	5	3.0	2	2.6	0	0.0	11	2.7
Keeping all courses from the previous record but not counting them in the cumulative totals	40	31.0	62	38.2	39	51.3	18	41.8	159	38.7
Keeping all courses from the previous record and only counting those courses which were above passing in cumulative totals	25	19.2	19	11.7	10	13.1	7	16.2	61	14.8
Other	28	21.5	40	25.0	16	21.0	12	28.0	96	23.4
TOTAL	130		162		76		43		411	

No response = 1,190

Table D.37

Question 37: Does your institution calculate and award graduation honors (Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.)?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	603	87.5	426	88.3	174	91.6	98	89.9	1,301	88.6
No	85	12.4	56	11.7	16	8.4	11	10.1	168	11.4
TOTAL	688		482		190		109		1,469	

No response = 132

Honors Based on a Minimum Grade Point Average

Table D.38

Question 38: Minimum grade average for Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
3.90 or above	282	53.0	177	47.4	61	46.9	29	43.3	549	49.8
3.80-3.89	158	29.7	116	31.1	40	30.8	20	29.8	334	30.3
3.75-3.79	58	10.9	57	15.3	20	15.4	10	14.9	145	13.2
3.74 or below	34	6.4	23	6.0	9	6.9	8	12.0	74	6.7
TOTAL	532		373		130		67		1,102	

No response = 499

Table D.39

Question 39: Minimum grade average for High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
3.80 or above	50	9.5	43	11.7	18	14.4	5	7.6	116	10.7
3.75-3.79	158	30.2	88	24.0	30	24.0	16	24.2	292	27.0
3.60-3.74	201	38.3	130	35.5	41	32.8	26	39.4	398	36.8
3.50-3.59	101	19.3	93	25.4	31	24.8	12	18.9	237	21.4
3.49 or below	14	2.7	12	3.4	5	4.0	7	9.9	38	3.5
TOTAL	524		366		125		66		1,081	

No response = 520

Table D.40

Question 40: Minimum grade average for Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
3.75 or above	18	3.3	18	4.7	4	2.9	3	4.2	43	3.8
3.60-3.74	38	6.9	21	5.5	11	8.0	6	8.3	76	6.6
3.50-3.59	258	46.8	170	44.4	65	47.1	28	38.9	521	45.5
3.40-3.49	81	14.7	47	12.3	19	13.8	11	15.3	158	13.8
3.25-3.39	114	20.7	77	20.1	23	16.7	16	22.2	230	20.1
3.00-3.24	40	7.3	50	13.0	14	10.1	7	9.7	111	9.7
2.99 or below	2	0.3	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	1.4	5	0.5
TOTAL	551		383		138		72		1,144	

No response = 457

Honors Based on a Percentage of Students

Table D.41

Question 41: Percentage of students used for calculation of Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
5% or less	53	80.3	56	83.5	30	83.3	22	88.0	161	83.0
6%-10%	7	10.6	8	11.9	5	13.9	3	12.0	23	11.9
11%-15%	2	3.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.5
16% or more	4	6.1	2	3.1	1	2.8	0	0.0	7	3.6
TOTAL	66		67		36		25		194	

No response = 1,407

Table D.42

Question 42: Percentage of students used for calculation of High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
5% or less	28	41.2	26	36.1	17	50.0	10	41.8	81	40.9
6%-10%	26	38.2	29	40.3	12	35.3	12	50.0	79	39.9
11%-15%	7	10.3	10	13.9	3	8.8	1	4.1	21	10.6
16%-20%	3	4.4	4	5.6	0	0.0	1	4.1	8	4.0
20% or more	4	5.9	3	4.1	2	5.9	0	0.0	9	4.5
TOTAL	68		72		34		24		198	

No response = 1,403

Table D.43

Question 43: Percentage of students used for calculation of Honors, Cum Laude, etc.

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
10% or less	34	44.1	26	34.2	19	50.0	17	63.0	96	43.6
10%-19%	24	31.1	32	42.1	15	39.5	7	26.0	78	35.5
20%-24%	12	15.6	10	13.2	1	2.6	2	7.4	25	11.4
25%-30%	1	1.3	1	1.3	1	2.6	0	0.0	3	1.4
31% or more	6	7.9	7	9.2	2	5.3	3	3.6	18	8.2
TOTAL	77		76		38		29		220	

No response = 1,383

Table D.44

Question 44: Approximately what percent of your students who received undergraduate degrees in the past year earned graduation honors? (All levels—Highest Honors, Summa Cum Laude, High Honors, Magna Cum Laude, etc.)

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
10% or less	112	20.7	100	27.1	57	38.3	37	45.7	306	26.7
11%-15%	116	21.5	92	24.9	27	18.1	20	24.7	255	22.2
16%-20%	93	17.2	63	17.1	28	18.8	8	9.9	192	16.8
21%-25%	86	15.9	43	11.7	13	8.7	5	6.2	147	12.8
26%-30%	57	10.6	39	8.7	10	6.7	6	7.3	112	9.8
31% or more	76	14.1	39	10.5	14	9.4	5	6.2	134	11.7
TOTAL	540		376		149		81		1,146	

No response = 462

Table D.45

Question 45: Do you include transfer grades when calculating graduation honors?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	140	23.4	119	28.1	38	22.2	19	19.0	316	24.4
Yes but with qualifications	53	8.7	25	5.9	26	15.2	8	8.0	112	
No	405	67.9	280	66.0	107	62.6	73	73.0	865	66.9
TOTAL	598		424		171		100		1,293	100.0

No response = 308

Table D.46

Question 46: Has your institution made any significant changes in its graduation honors during the past five years?

RESPONSE	2,499 OR LESS		2,500-9,999		10,000-19,999		20,000 +		TOTAL	PERCENT
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	95	15.8	67	15.8	28	16.3	17	16.7	207	15.9
If Yes:										
Made criteria more stringent *	72		54		18		17			
Made criteria more lenient *	19		8		7		0			
No	505	84.2	358	84.2	144	83.7	85	83.3	1,092	84.1
TOTAL	600		425		172		102		1,299	100.0

No response = 302

* Multiple responses or no responses were received so that the subtotal for these "If Yes" responses may exceed or fall short of the the total number of "Yes" responses.

Appendix E

AACRAO Membership Profiles

Table E.1

AACRAO Membership Profiles—1971, 1982, and 1992

	1971 MEMBERSHIP PROFILE	1982 MEMBERSHIP PROFILE	1992 MEMBERSHIP PROFILE
RESPONDENTS			
Total	1,651	1,997	2,302
TYPE			
2C	336	424	583
4C	555	—	—
4U	760	—	—
4C+4U	—	1,291	1,443
Other	—	242	286
CONTROL			
PU	687	817	1,058
PR	964	979	1,172
Other	—	201	71
SIZE			
< 1,000	577	—	—
< 2,500	—	1,000	1,269
1,000-2,499	688	—	—
2,500-5,000	—	316	373
5,000-9,999	218	274	322
10,000-19,999	115	206	220
20,000+	53	101	119

Table E.2

AACRAO Respondent Profiles—1971, 1982, and 1992

		1971 RESPONDENT PROFILE	1982 RESPONDENT PROFILE	1992 RESPONDENT PROFILE
RESPONDENTS				
	Total	1,278	1,638	1,601
	Rate	77%	82%	70%
TYPE				
	2C	279	373	388
	4C	468	730	613
	4U	531	445	480
	Other	—	90	120
CONTROL				
	PU	548	734	755
	PR	730	814	726
	Other	—	90	120
SIZE				
	< 1,000	440	—	—
	< 2,500	—	800	694
	1,000-2,499	522	—	—
	2,500-4,999	—	249	252
	5,000-9,999	162	211	246
	10,000-19,999	115	131	191
	20,000+	49	53	114
	Other	—	194	104

REFERENCES

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. 1987. *Directory of Colleges and Universities with Non-traditional Programs/Systems/Practices.* Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Astin, A.W., M.R. King, and G.T. Richardson. 1979. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1979.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Baird, L.L. and W.J. Feister. 1972. Grading standards/students: The relation of changes in average student ability to the average grades awarded. *American Educational Research Journal* 9(3):431-442.

Bess, D. 1975. Undergraduate grading systems: A rational approach. *College and University* 50(2):111-116.

Bolin, J.G. 1975. Cum laude? So what! *College and University* 50(3):213-224.

Bromley, D.G., M.L. Crow, and M.S. Gibson. 1978. Grade inflation: Trends, causes and implications. *Phi Delta Kappan* 10:694-697.

Burwen, L.S. 1971. *National Grading Survey.* San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Office of Institutional Research.

Carney, P., R.L. Isakson, and R. Ellsworth. 1978. An exploration of grade inflation and some related factors in higher education. *College and University* 53(2):217-230.

Claunch, S.J. 1972. Effects of pass-fail grading on quality point averages. *College and University* 47(2):93-105.

Cole, W. Janaury 6, 1993. By rewarding mediocrity, we discourage excellence. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* B1-B2.

Collins, J.R. and K.N. Nickel. 1974. *A Study of Grading Practices in Institutions of Higher Education.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 097 846).

Cook, M.K. 1985. Findings: Grade inflation and grading standards: Their effect on student academic award selection. *Engineering Education* 68(7):277-279.

Davidson, J. 1975. Academic interest rates and grade inflation. *Educational Record* 56(2):122-125.

de Nevers, N. 1984. An engineering solution to grade inflation. *Engineering Education* 74(7):661-663.

Delworth, U. 1973. The contract system: Student as participants in the grading process. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 14(3):277.

Geisinger, K.F. 1979. A note on grading policies and grade inflation. *Improving College and University Teaching* 27(3): 113-115.

Goldman, L. 1985. The betrayal of the gatekeepers: Grade inflation. *Journal of General Education* 37(2): 97-121.

Grieves, R. 1982. A policy proposal regarding grade inflation. *Educational Research Quarterly* 7(2):2-4.

Griffith, S.R. 1988. *Using the Results of a State-Mandated Student Outcomes Assessment Test to Reevaluate Curriculum and Policies: A Case Study.* Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Phoenix, AZ.

Hartman, L.G. 1920. Grading systems. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 106-112.

Helmreich, J.E. 1977. Is there an honors inflation? *College and University* 53(1):57-64.

Hendrickson, H.R. 1976. Grade inflation. *College and University* 52(1):111-116.

Juola, A.E. 1974. *Grade Inflation (1960-1973), A Preliminary Report.* East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of Education Services.

Levine, A. 1981. *Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lunneborg, P. 1978. *College Grades: What do Professors Intend to Communicate?* Seattle: University of Washington, Assessment Center.

Moellenberg, W. 1973. To grade or not to grade—is that the question? *College and University* 49(1):5-13.

Nicolson, F.E. 1917. Marking systems of colleges approved by the Carnegie Foundation. *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 234-237.

O'Connor, D. 1979. A solution to grade inflation. *Educational Record* 60(3):295-300.

Oliphant, R. 1980. Stalking the soft option: Some notes on overinflated grading standards. *Liberal Education* 66(4):431-439.

Oliver, E.E., S. Berry, J.E. Bevan, C.A. Cumbie, and E.E. Rhine. 1971. *The AACRAO Survey of Grading Policies in Member Institutions.* Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Petersen, I. March 13, 1972. Grade inflation on campuses adds to debate on marks. *New York Times* 1.

Philbrick, J.L. and P.I. O'Donnell. 1968. Precision in grading practices—panacea or problem? *Journal of Education Research* 62:163-176.

Polcynski, J. and L. Shirland. 1977. Expectance theory and contract grading combined as an effective motivational force for college students. *Journal of Education Research* 70:238-241.

Quann, C.J. 1974. Pass/fail—an unsuccess story. *College and University* 49(3):230-235.

Quann, C.J. 1984. *Grades and Grading: Historical Perspectives and the 1982 AACRAO Study*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Quann, C.J. 1987. *Plus (+) Minus (-) Grading: A Case Study and National Implications*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Quann, C.J. 1992. Grading by narrative evaluation: Present tense. *College and University* 69(1):22-31.

Ross, J.V. 1989. Recruiting and retaining adult students in higher education. In P.S. Cookson (ed.), *New Directions for Continuing Education: Recruiting and Retaining Adult Students* 41:49-62. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, R.A. 1975. Grades: Inflated, skewed or both? *College Board Review* 96:6-9.

Singer, T.S. 1993. *Changes in Undergraduate Grading Practices in Response to Grade Inflation in Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.

Singleton, R., Jr. and E.R. Smith. 1978. Does grade inflation decrease the reliability of grades? *Journal of Educational Measurement* 15(1):37-41.

Smallwood, M.L. 1935. *An Historical Study of Examinations and Grading Systems in Early American Universities*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Steeples, D.W. 1990. Concluding observations. In D.W. Steeples (ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education: Managing Change in Higher Education* 71: 101-108. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suslow, S. March, 1977. Grade inflation: End of a trend? *Change* 9:44-45.

Warren, J.R. 1975. *The Continuing Controversy over Grades*. Princeton, NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation—Educational Testing Service. (TM Report No. 51).

Weinstein, L. 1981. *Recruitment and Admissions: Opening the Door for Reentry Women*. Field evaluation draft. Washington, DC: Women's Educational Equity Act Program.

Winsor, J.L. 1977. A's, B's, but not C's: A comment. *Contemporary Education* 48(2):82-84.

Wissler, E.J. 1975. An A is an A is an E, or is it? *Engineering Education* 66(3):232-237.

GRADES AND GRADING PRACTICES
ORDER FORM

SHIP TO:					
Name					
Institution					
Address					
City/State/Zip+4					
Phone		FAX			

PLEASE SEND:					
ITEM	**No.**	**x**	**PRICE** Nonmember (Member)	**=**	**TOTAL**
Current Trends in Grades and Grading Practices in Undergraduate Higher Education: The Results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey		x	$18 ($15)	=	
			Shipping and Handling Fees*		
				TOTAL	

PAYMENT METHOD (check one box on first line):			
Check	MasterCard	VISA	American Express
Card Number			Exp. Date
Cardholder		Official Signature	

Send orders to: AACRAO Distribution Center
P.O. Box 231
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701
Phone: (301) 490-7651
FAX: (301) 206-9789

***Shipping and Handling Fees:** $3.50 for orders under $25, $5 for orders $25-$50, or 10% for orders over $50 ($5, $7.50, or 15%, respectively, for foreign orders).

Allow 2-4 weeks for delivery. Prices are subject to change without notice.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

One Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 330
Washington, DC 20036-1171

(202) 293-9161
FAX: (202) 872-8857

ISBN 0-929851-20-X